BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1852. NO. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

"*For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away.*" Luke ix. 25.

The question of questions is here presented for our consideration by the Lord Jesus. It is eminently a practical one—a question that demands a solution even before any worldly or speculative problem can lawfully occupy the attention for a moment. And yet, though of confessedly mighty magnitude, how often it is thrown aside! How often the merest trifle in comparison engrosses the mind: the present rules despotically over millions; the future—the momentous, the God-illuminated future—solicits consideration in vain. Will the reader condescend to remain by our side for a little till he learns a few of our thoughts regarding the problem in the text? It concerns you more than any question in the wide range of thought; and loving you with much affection, we desire to aid you in arriving at a correct apprehension of its terms, and of the only rational and scriptural solution it can receive. We have, you will please to observe, in the passage, a statement of gain, of loss, and a question as to the profit over the loss. In this order we shall endeavor to analyze and explain its contents:

I. THE GAIN.—"If he gain the whole world," or the greatest reachable amount of property and enjoyment. Our Lord knew that the desire of possessing property is a strong propensity in men generally; and here, to give his question effect, he supposes the utmost wish realized—all got that is within the conceivable grasp of a human being. What more could any one gain than "the whole world?" Our Lord imagines even it acquired; and then pushes into view his great life-problem, asks his hearer to solve it with the judgment-seat rapidly approaching, and the doom of the ungodly sounding in his ears.

We have said the phrase "the whole world" not merely, in our judgment, represents the greatest attainable amount of property, but also the largest quantity of enjoyment. We do not mean simply the greatest quantity of enjoyment arising from the owning of such a boundless estate; we refer also to every kind of pleasure that such an amount of property could command—pleasure for the eye, the ear—pleasure, in a word, for every sense, every passion, every power. Of worldly enjoyment, wealth stands as the acknowledged symbol; hence the heaviest store of gold or longest rent-roll, express in conventional language, the idea of exhaustless or varied enjoyment. Indeed, the most of men understand that the pleasure of possessing soon loses its zest and pungency; and were it not the power over unnumbered fountains of happiness (such as the happiness may be) that gold brings, its attraction would in many eyes speedily decline. The gold of California and of Australia is eagerly desired, and to grasp it, thousands toil amid privations and suffering; it is coveted not so much, however, for itself as for what it can bring, what it can obtain in the mart of nations, and in the domain of luxury and bewildering enchantment.

It is obvious that our Lord's words are designed not to be viewed in their narrow import in the problem he mentions; they are certainly to be generalized by us, and indeed it is only then that the real force and universal bearing can be rightly appreciated. Some one may say, "What to me is the whole world!" "Yea," he may be able to add, "I would scarcely toil a few months to be lord of all I survey." We admit the case, and yet the problem has a demand on such a person, though different in constitution from the most of his fellows. Something to him, however, is as "the whole world" to another. He has his chief desire, whether it relates to the inward or the outward of his being; to the acquisition of fame, of learning, of refined artistic execution; to the advancement of his children in prosperity, or even to the triumph of liberty and the downfall of despotism, or whatever the master and moving desire of his nature may be. Conceive you had this desire, or all that you desire sustaining a relation to the now, and life, and time granted to the full, and maintained in ever-outpouring enjoyment while you breathe, the question of Jesus has a claim on your intellect and conscience, and it would be foolish for you to refuse an hour longer to answer it.

Suppose, then, you set before your mind a Godless and a Christless man, and let him have all he can possibly obtain, or accomplish all that he can possibly achieve, according to the utmost measure of his unsanctified heart's desire, and you behold the gain side of the Saviour's problem, you are qualified so far to apprehend the weight and spirit of his inquiry. Verily, it amounts to this—it is present gain, and let it be what you please; it is present enjoyment, and let the enjoyment be what it may, it is the having the appetites and passions and members gratified as the flesh wills; a life now measured up to the largest wish in reference to its qualities and ministering circumstances, without the subjection of self to high principle, without the reception of the blessed Christ as the nurse and nutriment of our hearts, and the source of rules and peace and hope to us on earth's green floor. Such is the profit—the gain. We now advance to consider—

II. THE LOSS.—"Lose himself, or be cast away."

1st. *He loses himself.* Not his happiness, not his "whole world" which he previously gained, not the pleasant angel of hope in his breast, but himself—his very being in the universe. He might lose all the properties and acquirements that render life agreeable, and yet retain himself—continue in consciousness; let him, however, lose himself, and he is immediately as if he had never been. The language before us is of a popular kind, for, strictly speaking, a man cannot lose himself, as he can lose a bank bill, or any of his enjoyments; and, though the matter is

very plain, this whole subject has been so mystified and misrepresented, that we do well to look into every corner and chase away the last atom of darkness. The loss, be it observed, is the *man himself*, which, without controversy, the man cannot feel, cannot be conscious of; because, if he could have feeling in any degree, that would be demonstration that himself—the man—was not flung into non-being, or was not lost. The dominant theology would have us to believe the man penally lost, and to feel the loss; that is, to be lost and not lost at the same time—to have parted with every attribute of being and yet to retain them, which is gloriously absurd; for which let us be thankful. Losing himself then just means ceasing to be; returning to non-existence, whence he originally came.

The same idea is expressed in Mark 8: 36, "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Viewed side by side with our text, this language "lose his own soul" becomes very plain; even alone, it most emphatically conveys the idea that the unholy shall ultimately cease to exist. "Lose his own soul"—what does that mean? The man is represented as losing his soul—not his happiness, nor hope, nor the Divine smiles, but his *own soul.* Now, what is a man without a soul? Nothing, for the idea of a man and a soul are substantially one. To make a man, you must produce a soul, for there cannot be a man without a soul, and to make a human soul is to make a human being, capable of all responsible functions as a moral agent, and susceptible also of suffering and pleasure. For a man, then, to lose his soul, is, in other words, a soul losing itself, or, as it is in the text, a man losing himself, his being, departing from conscious existence. A man might lose happiness, and yet keep his soul; a man might lose heaven and the mercy and favor of God, and yet retain his soul; but he cannot lose his soul, and yet continue a soul, for that would be losing a soul and keeping a soul at the same moment! Losing consciousness, an essential attribute of a living soul, or of a living *self*, and yet preserving it! Losing self and yet preserving self, which is utterly impossible.

In the passage from Mark, the Greek word rendered "soul" is the same that in the context of that verse, and in the parallel passage in Matthew, as well as in many other parts of the New Testament, is translated "life;" and the verse from Mark may most properly be rendered "what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his *own life?* So rendered it conveys the idea which is given in the text. The man is to lose his life, and when a man loses his life, is he not as if he had never been? Can he lose life, and yet in any sense be alive? Can he be conscious of having lost that which is essential to consciousness itself? To lose the life, then, is to cease to be, not here, but anywhere in space, and losing life—losing his soul—and losing himself, are only different modes of expressing the same awfully solemn thought, that the doom of the godless is that they shall be finally swept from conscious existence, as unfit for being.

The prevailing theology teaches that the unholy are to be visited with ceaseless torments in hell, as the reward of their evil ways. Now, just imagine a poor sinner in that agony; an agony waxing, at a fixed ratio, more and more intense. Tossing there on the boiling flood, has he lost himself? What think ye he would say, were one to exclaim in his hearing, "O! mad sinner! you have, being Christless, lost yourself at last." Mocked—would he not feel in the midst of his burning woe? Lost himself! Lost himself! and every moment producing a more intense consciousness of himself; for pain augments the sensitiveness of consciousness, and makes a being terribly alive to the fact that he *is*, and also to what it is to be. Lost his life! and yet living in agony! Lost his soul, and he—the man—the soul, tormented! O! mockery of truth! O! insult to language! O daring perversion of his threatenings, who is ordained to be the judge of quick and dead. Popular theology affirms the wicked man shall not lose himself, but shall last perpetually condemning himself, and enduring the vengeance of sulphurous fires; God says, the unholy shall lose themselves, they shall cease to be capable of pain or pleasure; in a word, they shall die. "The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away." Ps. 37: 20. How great the contrast! How mournful to think that millions are believing a lie, and that myriads are preaching it from day to day.

2d. We have now to consider the remaining words "*or be cast away.*" This is the same idea under a slightly different aspect; for you notice the man is to "lose himself," "*or*" (not *and*) "be cast away." To lose himself is to be cast away, and he loses himself by being cast away. Now we do not think the idea is that he loses himself by casting himself away, or by rushing on to death in Gehenna; but that he will lose himself, his being, when he is cast away by the Omnipotent Judge—not cast away from hope, but from being itself. In one sense, he casts himself away; in a higher acceptation, he does not, since life is to be withdrawn from the impenitent by the divinely appointed agents of destruction; God will burn them up root and branch.

To our view the verse perfectly harmonizes with the alarming passage in 2 Thess. 1: 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," that is, a destruction to issue from the Lord, or a destruction of which he is the Author.

3d. This loss of self is to be irrevocable—hopeless. A man may lose himself for a while, or forever; in other words, a man may pass into the unconsciousness of death for a day, for a thousand years, or for an eternity. Now the self-loss here spoken of is eternal; they are to be punished with an everlasting destruction, not an everlasting preservation in torment, but destruction, and one that is never in the lapse of ages to be repaired. No resurrection follows the second death; the *end* is destruction; they shall never see life. Some have lost themselves voluntarily, or resigned their present life for Jesus and his gospel, and now they rest in the silence of the grave. But they will find themselves again—they shall ere long awake to a new and glorious state of being—to the crown of martyrdom likewise, and the songs of salvation before the enthroned Redeemer. Alas! for the apostates who preserved themselves here, or preferred life to the honor of Jesus and the purity of their consciences; they and all the godless shall be reduced to ashes, and no eye shall ever see them more. They shall be blotted from the roll of being—from the page of life. They had their portion in this life, and of this life, they preferred the now to the after—present enjoyment to immortal being and felicity. Streams may be dried up, and again murmur along their ancient channels; trees that have been long reckoned dead, may send forth green shorts to wave in the sunshine; the land that has apparently been cursed with sterility, may anew bloom like Paradise; stars that ceased to shine in the high places of the firma-

ment, may afresh be kindled, but no forth-putting of Divine reviving energy shall restore the condemned and consumed to being; the long moonless and morningless night of forgetfulness is their unalterable portion.

"Appalling end, most melancholy—sad,
To be expelled existence hopelessly;
To be unconscious when the saved are glad
Before the throne, throughout eternity;
Numbered with things that were for age to be
Unworthy of a name, a place, a rank,
In this fair universe by Heaven's decree;
O direful doom! but better far a blank
Than wretches ever scorched on Tophet's brimstone bank.
O direful doom indeed! but why forget
It is their choice? for men may live or die;—
On wings of faith escape the penal threat,
Or with the last in condemnation lie.
And when at length the hours of mercy fly,
And God apportions each his chosen lot,
Whom can the sinner blame? when on his eye
Oblivion's night descends, to vanish not—
Whom can the sinner blame?—what he decreed he got."

III. THE QUESTION—"what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away?"

The humblest capacity can discover that the proper answer is, it will advantage him nothing. The price of his present enjoyment and impiety is the loss of being itself. In the recent exhibition in London, there was one diamond, 'the mountain of light,' as it was called, of immense value. Now, suppose it cast into the deep, and that a man dives for the treasure, and finds it, but expires with it in his grasp, just as he reaches the surface of the wave—what would it profit him to have gained the diamond and to lose his life? So here, the present enjoyments of a godless life consume in the end being itself; the reward of sin is the darkness of non-existence. An infinitesimal gain, and an infinite loss; a straw, gathered from the flood of time, prized beyond the glory and gladness of interminable duration; a drop preferred to an exhaustless ocean; a grain to a kingdom, and a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; a worm-like being to one kindred with a seraph's, yea, approximating his on whom all existence hangs as his robe and his shadow.

What, then, beloved reader, will it avail you to gain all you can desire now, and be thus impoverished, thus cancelled from being at last? You may understand the calculation before us, the loss and the gain; you may admit the accuracy of our development of the two sides of the balance sheet, and yet you may refuse to act on the discovery that the loss will inexpressibly transcend the gain, that in fact all comparison between the two is imperiously debarred. You may shun the momentous theme, we cannot exclude this possibility from our thoughts; will you, in mercy to yourself, disappoint our fears? Will you yield to our most ardent wish, and henceforth renounce the profitless service of sin and Satan. In the end it is unqualified loss; sometimes in this scene, we admit, it has the semblance of gain. You may have a godless life in time, but there shall not be for any a godless eternity; it is enough for God to be mocked for a period; he will not be slighted and blasphemed by creature tongue forever. Now, the great Redeemer implores you to calculate the problem of being; a godless present and no eternity; a holy, grateful, self-denying life here, and everlasting duration in the company of the Lamb and his angels. Think, that a life of sin—a life out of Jesus—is nothing else than a toiling for death; a hurrying from night to night; a long prayer, if I may so express myself, that the gates of existence may at length be shut upon you by an omnipotent arm; and that prayer will be answered when the penal-destroying elements come forth to burn up the moral chaff and vile corruption that shall be found in the Universe at the end of time. Man must be renewed by love, or removed by power; conquered by grace or consumed by fire. At present the angel of love waits and beckons the guilty to the Saviour's side. The compassion of the Eternal has appeared in a thousand forms to your view; its fairest and richest manifestation was in the person of his Son, who was sent into the world that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. He is the brightness of his Father's glory. Have you seen him? You have seen the Father. Jesus was love—love was Jesus—the friend of man, the revealer of heaven, the conquerer of hades, the bringer of immortality. With him you have the pledge of being; because he lives, his disciples shall live also; without him, without his grace, his transforming power, his lovely image, his indwelling spirit, you are an heir of ruin, and angels will yet weep over your end, as they are now deploring your progress in sin. He desires your love, and that you may yield him your heartiest homage and affection, he unfolds to you the greatness of his compassion for you as you are; assures you of his desire for your recovery to righteousness, your reconciliation to his Father, your enrolment among the heirs of immortality. Lose a world, rather than lose Jesus; gain a whole world, and what will it avail when the horrors of destruction are thickening around your being, when Gehenna demands you as fuel for its quenchless flames? My brother, think; the text appeals to you as a reflecting being. One is filled with horror and unspeakable disgust in contemplating the popular hell: the bible revelation as to the doom of the wicked imparts an awfully solemn feeling to the heart. The one unhinges or excludes consideration; the other awakens reflection, and it does not outrage reason, nor remorselessly harrow the sympathies of humanity. The nearer you come to the one you are the more disqualified for the exercise of your intellectual capacities; the other—the further you penetrate its enclosures and chambers, makes you the more intensely thoughtful, and the more alive to the hopelessness of men disconnected with Jesus. To him, therefore, when serious thought is, as we fondly trust, excited in your mind; to him we would affectionately conduct you, and the while tell you of his tears, and groans, and agonies, and triumphs in the sublime effort he made to redeem you from sin and its fruits. Behold thy Saviour! He died for you; will you not begin to live for him? Will you not taste his love that flows like a soft stream from his heart; its taste is sweeter than nectar; its healing and reviving virtues pass an angel's description. Be wise, and count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus your Lord, and strive to attain unto the resurrection from among the dead, and the kingdom whose splendor and blessedness shall not pass away.

—o—

Deal gently with those who stray. Draw them back by love and persuasion. A kiss is worth a thousand kicks. A kind word is more valuable to the lost than a mine of gold. Think of this, and be on your guard, ye who would chase to the grave an erring brother.

[Communicated.]

UNIVERSALISM.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS.

To the Editor of the Ambassador, J. M. Austin.

Sir:—I am not a subscriber to the Ambassador, but I am an interested reader of it, for which privilege I am indebted to one of your subscribers, George French, an inmate of our family—not that I am a Universalist for various reasons, which will appear hereinafter. I was taught to believe the doctrine of eternal misery by my father, who was a Baptist Minister, and I sincerely believed it to be true and taught of God in the Bible till about four years ago, being a member of that order. Were eternal misery or the views entertained by Universalists the only alternatives, reasoning as both do, from common ground, as to man's nature, I should not hesitate to decide in favor of the God-honoring system of the latter in comparison with the former. But by being led to doubt the truth of eternal misery, by presuming to read some of the writings of George Storrs, I commenced studying the scriptures as one entirely ignorant of what was taught therein, with an intense desire, which time does not abate, to find out what was true—to see what relation we sustained to God—what end he had in view in creating man, and allowing him the freedom of choice, together with the design of government—and as fast, and far, as I have succeeded in fathoming the meaning of the sacred writers in relation to these points, and others connected therewith, so fast, and so far, I have renounced my former absurd and contradictory imaginings for a comprehensible can-be-told system—and am now prepared to follow the injunction, to be always ready to give a reason of the hope I entertain with meekness and fear—emphatically so. In the Ambassador for Oct. 11th, I saw a notice calling the attention of all who would read, to a sermon on the first page. Time was when my prejudices would have so blinded me, that if I had read anything that I knew was from a Universalist, it would have been of little use, for I should not have been able or competent to have appreciated any argument, however well founded. But a better and happier state of feeling has obtained, and Truth, wherever found, is now lovely to me, though there is so much that is called truth afloat, it is rather staggering to a looker-on; yet, in the full confidence that Truth is one, and that all truth is capable of being clearly demonstrated, I will not despair. It argues well for the adherents of any system, when they covet investigation, as truth can lose nothing thereby, and if it should chance to be error that is entertained, and truth is the object sought after, certainly a good exchange would be made if error could be bartered for truth. I have lived, formerly, where I could have almost daily friendly converse with Universalists, and I have tried to become acquainted with their views, so that I could see and appreciate the ground of their belief, and I think with the additional light of the sermon spoken of above, which is alleged to be an expose of Universalism, I have a tolerably correct view of the doctrine. Now, you have solicited the attention and criticism of religious editors and writers of all denominations to this sermon, and if you included females amongst the writers, then I may write. You ask to have objections candidly pointed out, and that is due and meet. Jesus was candid. And you have said, "there shall be no offence on our part"—urging a thorough investigation. This assurance leads me to think I shall be heard while I attempt to show some of the errors of your system. I have long had it in my mind to do so, but have been waiting to get a better understanding of the case, and also to see an open door, or chance to be heard. This seems to be the proper occasion. I well know it is a nice business to get round this sermon, or in other words, to make the nice distinctions that are necessary in the case, and make those distinctions clear to the understanding. I must confess, however, I do not see how you can well avoid such conclusions respecting the final destiny of all, with such views of the nature of man—the paternal character of God—the end or design of punishment—as I see are entertained by you as a body, from this sermon, and other articles of the Ambassador, with the general tenor of the policy. I should think both must stand or fall together. So that my objections will not be so much objections to this sermon as they will be objections to that which leads to such a view as is indicated herein in giving *we* such a latitude. There is one part of the sermon, that has my cordial sympathy, and that is from where he commences to tell what is necessary to be efficient laborers in the moral vineyard onwards to its close. But as to the former part, I must confess I fail to see any very good reasons why we should be very much engaged to labor for others here, this side of the grave, just for what more would be enjoyed by them in the interim; seeing it is so difficult to be heard, amidst the din of conflicting passions, as it is also difficult to stem the tide of selfishness, and if the wicked are so much better circumstanced hereafter and the means necessary to reform them, so much more available there, it does seem to me that the best and easiest way is, so far as others are concerned, to let the matter rest till then—for as the wicked shall not live out half of their days, they will pass through what you call the resurrection state the sooner into this favorable situation, and in that case it seems as though we should be ungenerous to attempt to stay them. I cannot see how such conclusions can be avoided, if you are right, and I should like to know how you can keep from thinking so and acting accordingly. I think, however, the key to all this is given in the sermon of Rev. J. B. Sap, at the funeral of Br. L. A. Wright, when he says that "if Jeremiah, David and Christ knew nothing about an endless hell, the dogma is false which teaches that there is one; and if that is not true, the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind is true." That they knew nothing of such a place, and taught nothing of it, is, I think, sure, and if I can understand them, they taught as little respecting the other extreme, which extreme was and is adopted, as it seems, by the above declaration, as a matter of course, on finding out the falsity of eternal misery, without once thinking there can be any other alternative. Much is due your body for being instrumental in exposing this dire dogma in all its depravity. Your system seems far more honoring to God in many respects. But there is a superlative degree, and I find the scripture writers advocating neither of the above views, if I can understand them; but this system, superior to either, inasmuch as, viewed in whatever light it may be, it seems liable to no objections save what may arise from unenlightened and uninformed sympathy, so I call it the superlative degree. In and of myself, I shrink at the thought of meeting such strong confidence as is expressed in regard to the truth of your position. Nothing but the desire that Jesus and his followers' views should be understood, relative to these all-important topics, nerves me up to take my pen in their vindication. Otherwise the task had been left to

abler minds and hands which have less to do than mine. As it is, however, (God by his spirit, without which none can do anything, being my helper,) I will do the best I can in redeeming my pledge, hoping that my humble efforts to justify the ways of God to man, will be accepted and blessed. As Jesus said, so say I, "my doctrine is not mine," so I assume no responsibility, but leave that to its Author—my only care being to speak on good authority.

1st. I will notice your view of the nature of man. I gather from this sermon, and the general tenor of the articles of your paper, that the spirit, or soul, (as I see they are used synonymously,) is regarded as the man proper, or that which is saved—that the body or house which holds the man, dies, and thus the hitherto fettered and clogged soul wings its way to the skies, or enters on a higher life, or a second and better disciplinary state, to fit it for its ultimate destiny. The Bible says that the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground. Gen. 2: 7. The spirit is not formed thus, so that the spirit is not the man to begin with. But of what use is such a grand piece of mechanism without some power to set and keep it in motion? None at all. So He that made him, "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" and it should be borne in mind constantly that beings made of dust become living souls just in that way now. Men and women, beasts, birds, and fishes, are living souls alike. Gen. 1: 30, and 7: 22, (margin.) The spirit is not a living soul, it is the spirit of God in our nostrils that makes living souls of us, and all. Job. 22: 3; and the difference is in the variety of structures, and not in the spirit or power, (Gen. 7: 22,) by means of which all act; and if he (God) sets his heart on man and gathers to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to his dust. Job 34: 14–15. That is, where he came from, and what God defines death to be. Gen. 3: 19. And he says, too, his spirit shall not always strive with man, because he is flesh, yet his days shall be 120 years, and during that time, it would strive with them—thereby justifying Paul's assertion to the Corinthians, that they were temples of the living God, and if any man defiles the temple of God, him will God destroy. 1 Cor. 3: 17. For those to whom this was spoken gave little heed to the spirit of Christ in Noah, 1 Peter 3: 19, warning them to forsake their pollutions, and by means of this spirit to mortify the deeds of the body, through and live; so they were destroyed that they might no longer curse the earth. David says his (man's) breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish.

I have quoted these texts above to show what man is—and by these we see that man is one thing, and the spirit is quite another. Man, it is true, as well as every other creature, is dependant on this spirit for all he knows, wills, and does. What though a man should gain the whole world and lose his life or soul? (Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to say nothing of the others, use the terms life and soul synonymously.) What good would possessions do a dead man? When the spirit goes, the life or soul (which the Bible says is the blood, though used ambiguously,) must die; for James says "the body without the spirit or breath (margin) is dead." But man has no control over the spirit when it is demanded of him. Eccl. 8: 8. Nor after it has left him. His only care should be to make a good use of it while permitted to retain it, seeing the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal, dividing to every one severally as he wills. 1 Cor. 12: 7–11. The inspiration of the Almighty gives man understanding. Job 32: 8. He would know nothing without it, and can know nothing without it, for the dead know not anything. Eccl. 2: 5. Hezekiah of old was very glad to have his soul kept back from the pit or grave fifteen years longer, for he wanted to praise the Lord; and he knew the dead could not do that. But he says, the living, the living, they shall praise thee as I do this day. Isaiah 38: 17–19. David, too, said he should be satisfied when he awaked with his likeness. It seems that the same or similar opinions prevailed in the Apostles' time about the state of the dead as are now prevalent, for Peter found it necessary to assure those who were witnesses of the wonderful manifestation of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, that David had nothing to do with it, because he was dead and buried, and his sepulchre was then with them—and more convincing still, he told them David had not ascended into the heavens. Acts 2: 29–34. Job said, the dead would not be raised nor waked out of their sleep till the heavens be no more; and he wanted to be hid in the grave, and have a time appointed, to be remembered, and to be called and he would answer. Job 14: 10–14. Jesus died and was buried, but his soul was not left in hell or the grave. Acts 2: 31. He committed his spirit to his Father, and God restored it to him again, and thus raised him up from the dead. It was impossible for death to hold him, being sinless. Acts 2: 24. Paul says if the spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, (and it will dwell in those who do not defile the temple so as to be destroyed,) he that raised Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you. Rom. 8: 11. Not to particularize further, Paul says, all the ancients, from Abel down to his time, who had faith in the promise of eternal life and its accompanying blessings, thereby becoming heirs of the righteousness which is by faith, died, not having received the promises. These promises, viz: the possession of the land where he lived, or rather the world, (Rom. 4: 13,) and in thee shall all nations be blessed, every one that has the faith he had being blessed with him, (Gal. 3: 8–9,) and that he should be the father of many nations, were made known to him (Abraham) before he died, and he with all the others, saw them afar off, and being persuaded of them, (Heb. 11: 13,) they were not afraid to trust God, but fell asleep in full confidence that what God had promised, he was able also to perform in due time; and even Moses showed that the dead are raised, when he called God, or the Lord, the God of Abraham, &c. Luke 20: 37. Some of these ancients were tortured to death, and would not accept deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection; (Heb. 11: 35,) for they well knew that if they loved their lives so well, that, for the sake of staying here a few years longer at most, they should betray their trust, they would forfeit their claim to eternal life. Paul thought thus too. He counted everything but dung that he might win Christ and be found in him, &c.; he was content to share his sufferings, and felt it cheaply won, if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Phil. 3: 9–11. In keeping with these sentiments he told the Thessalonians they must not sorrow about those that were asleep (in Jesus) as those did who had no hope, (of a resurrection,) for God would bring them again from the dead as he did Jesus, and that they would eventually meet the Lord together; and that they must comfort one another with these words. 1 Thess. 4: 13–18. We look in vain in scripture for

survivors comforting bereaved ones with the assurance that the departed were happy in heaven.

There are three points I want to prove by the above:—

1st. That man dies, and his work ceases, and unless made alive again, he is as though he had never been, because, if there be no resurrection, or if Christ be not raised, then they which are fallen asleep in him are perished, too, to say nothing of those out of him, who die in Adam. 1 Cor. 15: 15–18.

2d. That none enter into eternal life at death—for, notwithstanding the spirit we had from God, returns then to the Giver, yet man is not benefitted thereby, unless restored to him again; and further, let it be what it may, it needs to go but a little way to go to God, for Paul says, he is not far from every one of us. Acts 17: 27. Which is not as your poets sing, as well as myself in former days.

3d. That the prevalent notions and anticipations about the spirit are baseless. And let me say to mothers, that it is our children we should try to train, that they may be fit habitations for this pure spirit. The spirit we have nothing to do with, any further than to make it subservient to the purposes designed, while permitted to retain it. We neither gave it to them, nor are we to take it. And can parents cast off the fear of God themselves, and forbear to teach it to their children, which fear is the beginning of knowledge, (Prov. 1: 7,) and neglect to train them in the way they should go, and then empty them into the world, to cast a blight wherever they may go, (unless they chance to learn from other sources to love righteousness and the benefits and blessings of obedience,) and then complain that it should go ill with them, or that their end should be destruction? Here, before proceeding further, allow me to ask two questions. What is the purgatory of the Roman Catholics but a state or place of discipline for the purification of souls? Does not the prevalent opinion of the nature of the soul lead to all these various and conflicting theories about its welfare and whereabouts at death, since imagination is the only guide in the case?

To resume. 2d. The paternal relation and the ground of God's impartiality is misapprehended.

That God is the Father of the spirits of all flesh is readily allowed, and the former of all in one sense, (though I should hardly be willing to charge him with making all the miserable, degraded specimens of humanity that breathe his air and live on his benificence—their being here, and thus degraded, being better accounted for on Paul's theory, Rom. 1: 21–31,) but he is not the Father of all flesh, because he has made all, nor of man, because he has made him, more than of any other creature; but man is the only creature which of his good pleasure he has endowed with a capacity "to will and to do"—consequently man alone can be tempted with evil, and voluntarily yield to it, or manfully resist and overcome temptation. So that he alone of all the creatures God has made, can obtain a knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue, by means of which he can escape the corruptions that are in the world through lust, and thereby become a partaker of the divine nature. 2 Pet. I: 3–4. Those that believe on his name, John says, have the power to become the sons of God. John 1: I2. To man alone is held out the unspeakable honor of attaining the rank of becoming sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, by coming out from the world, &c. 2 Cor. 6: 18. Jesus taught his disciples to say, Our Father, &c., and they had a right to, on the ground of their discipleship, for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God by anticipation only, because, by submitting to be led by the Spirit of God, they had received the spirit of adoption, whereby they could cry Abba, Father, and every believer may do the same. Rom. 8: 14–15. But the adoption itself is an object of hope, and what must be waited for till the redemption of the body, when the sons of God will be manifested. Rom. 8: 19–23. The unbelieving Jews claimed God as their Father, and unbelieving Gentiles have the same right, for Paul says he is God of one as well as the other. Rom. 3: 29. The heathen poets claimed the same, and Paul asserts to have assumed their position for the purpose of showing them the absurdity of worshipping senseless idols. Acts 17: 28. Jesus told those unbelievers that if God was their Father, they would do the works of God, or would love him. John 8: 42. And in the 44th verse he told them that they were of their father the devil, and his lusts ye will do. In the 21st, 23d and 24th verses, he tells them, if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins, and where I am ye cannot come, and because ye are of this world, or beneath, and I am not. This shall suffice to establish the ground of the parental relation.

[To be continued.]

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

BY THE EDITOR.

That great confusion exists with regard to the commencement and termination of the prophetic periods must be manifest to every reflecting and impartial mind. Historians and chronologists are anything but united on the exact *time* of many important events which are necessary to define with accuracy the time of the beginning or ending of most of those periods. The chronology of some of the events noted in the scriptures is based upon these conflicting and discordant materials; and too much reliance upon profane chronology and popular mistakes as to the reigning king of the times in which the scripture event happened, has led into great errors in the interpretation of the prophecies. This, we conceive, is especially the case with the *ninth* chapter of Daniel.

Let us take a view of the generally received chronology in the Bible in a few particulars. The chronology put against Ezra 1: 1, or the Decree of Cyrus, is B. C. 536. Haggai 1st commences with the second year of Darius, and the chronology is put down at 520 B. C., when the house of God or temple was put forward to its completion by Haggai and Zerubbabel at God's command; that is, just sixteen *years* after the decree of Cyrus; and Ezra 6: 15, tells us "this house was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king:" that is, according to the common received chronology, within *twenty-one* years after Cyrus' decree; and yet, strange to tell, commentators and chronologists have fixed upon the decree of Artaxerxes II., B. C. 457, or *fifty-eight years after the temple is finished*, according to their chronology, as "*the* commandment" that went "forth to restore and build Jerusalem!" Also, according to their chronology of Dan. 9th, B. C. 538, the "seventy years desolation of Jerusalem" (ending at that time, Dan. 9: 2,) ended *eighty-one years* before the commandment went forth to restore and build Jerusalem, i. e., if 457 B. C. is the true point from which to reckon that commandment; and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five years* before Ezra went up to restore and build Jerusalem!

It has seemed to be taken for granted that the Darius of Dan. 9th is the same as the Darius who

took Babylon. From a careful examination of the subject, we are fully satisfied this is a great mistake. In consequence of this mistake, that chapter has been thrust in between the 8th and 10th chapters, and thus led into inextricable confusion all who have based their calculations upon that theory.

Daniel himself, if carefully examined, shows that these Dariuses were two different and distinct persons. Chapter 5: 31, tells us, "Darius the *Median* took the kingdom;" the 9th chapter says, "In the first year of Darius the *son of Ahasuerus* of the seed of the Medes." The Scriptures give us Ahasuerus as the husband of Esther, Esther 2: 16, and the chronology in the margin of our Bible gives this event B. C. 462. Artaxerxes I. reigned between Cyrus and Darius king of Persia, "son of Ahasuerus." Any one must be satisfied of this, we think, who, with an unprejudiced mind, carefully reads the 4th chapter of Ezra. Artaxerxes I. died B. C. 424. See Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66. Says Taylor—"On the death of Artaxerxes, his only legitimate son, Xerxes, ascended the throne; but within forty-five days was murdered by his natural brother, Sogdianus; and he again was deposed by another illegitimate prince, Ochus, who, on his accession, took the name of Darius II." This king was surnamed Nothus, that is, "*illegitimate.*" He was called illegitimate because not the son of Artaxerxes, but of Ahasuerus, and was most most likely born of Esther, a Jewess, and therefore would be accounted as not legitimately heir to the throne of *Persia.* It seems to us clear that Darius Nothus is the Darius of Daniel 9th, and he came to that throne about 424 B. C., instead of B. C. 538, as would seem by the chronology now found in the margin of the Bible. If this be so, then all the other chronological dates in the margin of the Book of Daniel are equally erroneous.

Darins Nothus reigned at a later period than Cyrus (whose Persian name is Coresch,) king of Persia. The communication, therefore, made to Daniel, chap. 9, was at a later period than that of the 10th, 11th, and 12th chapt's; and its chronological position in the Book of Daniel is *after* the 12th chapter. Darius Nothus, or "Darius the son of Ahasuerus," is the same, we judge, as Ezra's "Darius king of Persia." Ez. 4: 5; and cannot therefore be identical with "Darius the Median," but corresponds with the Darius of Haggai 1: 1, and Zech. 1: 1; and what further confirms this idea is, that in the "second year" of this Darius, the *seventy years'* indignation of the Lord against Jerusalem ceased. See Zech. 1: 1, 12. The seventy years' indignation which the angel here declared was completed, in the second year of Darius, is identical with the seventy years' desolations which were terminating in "the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus;" for the desolations ceased when the work of rebuilding the temple had such a putting forward as resulted in its completion; that was from the "second year of Darius king of Persia." See Ezra 4: 24, and 5: 1–2; therefore, it follows conclusively that Darius the son of Ahasuerus, (Dan. 9: 1,) is the same as the Darius of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechriah; and hence reigned at a *later period* than the Scripture Cyrus (Coresch,) king of Persia, and king of Babylon, and therefore was not "Darius the Median," who reigned *before* Cyrus. If these things are so, it follows that *the chronology relied upon in fixing the dates of the prophetic periods is erroneous, and will forever delude those who follow it.*

Again, as Cyrus reigned before Darius Nothus, or "Darius son of Ahasuerus," and as Daniel's seventy weeks, seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, were given him under this latter king, it follows that the decree of Cyrus, to restore and build Jerusalem, was previous to the 9th chapter of Daniel; and it is abundantly evident that the *decree of Cyrus*, and not that of Artaxerxes, is the decree spoken of by Gabriel to Daniel. This we know will be startling to some who have labored to make the generally received chronology harmonize with the facts in history and prophecy; and yet it is demonstration, to our mind, that the decree of Cyrus is *the decree* of which Gabriel speaks, Dan. 9th.

Let us turn to Isa. 44: 28, and we shall see what the Lord saith concerning Cyrus. "Cyrus is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, *thou shalt be built*, and to the Temple, *thy foundation shalt be laid.*" This language exactly tallies with Gabriel's annunciation—"Know, also, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to *build* Jerusalem," &c. Here is a distinct reference to some prophecy on the subject; no other prophecy can be found that so exactly corresponds as that which relates to the acts of Cyrus; and if we are correct as to the chronology of Dan. 9th, that decree of Cyrus had been issued prior to Gabriel's announcement of the time at which to commence the seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, so that Daniel had a definite point at which to begin his reckoning, viz: at the decree of Cyrus. As Cyrus is the only person *prophesied* of as issuing such a decree for the specified object, we have a right to conclude *that* is "the commandment" intended by Gabriel. The question arises, *did Cyrus issue a decree exactly corresponding with the prophecy in Isaiah and the declaration of Gabriel?*

In examining this point, we have nothing to do with profane chronology, or the chronology of historians. The Bible must settle the question, and if profane chronology does not tally with it, we have a right to conclude that such chronology is false, and not to be trusted.

Let us now examine the foregoing question. Cyrus did issue just such a commandment as agrees with Isaiah and Gabriel. See Ezra 1: 2, "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven HATH CHARGED ME TO BUILD HIM A HOUSE AT JERUSALEM. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem. Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah, and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, with all them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem."

Let us next see how this "commandment" was attended to. In the 3d chapter, after noticing the offerings made by the people when they arrived at Jerusalem, it is said, verse 7, "They gave money also unto the masons, and to the carpenters; and meat, and drink, and oil, unto them of Zidon, and to them of Tyre, to bring cedar-trees from Lebanon to the sea of Joppa, according to the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia." Then verses 10 and 11 say, "And when the builders *laid the foundation of the temple* of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites the sons of Asaph with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David king of Israel. And they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord; because he is good, for his mercy

endureth forever toward Israel. And the people shouted with a great shout when they praised the Lord, *because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.* But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, *when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes*, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted."

Thus we have an exact fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy; and that the building *the city* was included in Cyrus' commandment is clear from the letter which the enemies of the Jews afterwards wrote to Artaxerxes I., Ezra 4: 12; "Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, *building the* rebellious and the bad *city*, and have *set up the walls thereof*, and joined the foundations." Here, then, we have also a clear sight of the point of time to which Gabriel pointed as "the *going forth* of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem." The decrees of Artaxerxes and Darius were only an *approval* of the decree of Cyrus, and not "the going forth of the commandment" to have the work done. See Ezra 6: 14, "And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia." "According to the *commandment* (singular) of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes," &c. The commandment was *one*, originating with Cyrus, but confirmed by Artaxerxes, who finally revoked his *approval*, Ezra 4: 17–24; the decree itself was *unalterable*, according to the laws of the Medes and Persians, but it was renewed by Darius king of Persia, in the second year of his reign, which was the next year after Daniel's prayer, chap. 9, who having examined the ancient records at Babylon, (see Ezra 4: 24,) found the roll containing the decree of Cyrus, Ezra 6: 1–5; and confirmed that decree in strong language, as may be seen, Ezra 6: 6–12; which concludes with saying, "Let it be done with speed." From that time, the Jews under the prophesying of Haggai and Zechariah, [see Ezra 6: 14; and Haggai 1st and 2d chs.,] carried forward the work so rapidly that "this house was finished in the sixth year of Darius," Ezra 6: 15; or, within five years from the time Daniel so earnestly entreated God to "cause" his "face to shine upon the sanctuary that is desolate." Thus was the prayer of this man of God speedily answered, though he, possibly, did not live to see it, as he must have been about ninety-five years old "in the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1852.

"A RAP."—Our readers will remember the inquiry we made in our last, after "*The Spirit World.*" We said it had *disappeared*—that we had "continued to send the Examiner directed to" it, &c. The Examiner containing our remarks we again directed to the Spirit World, and asked, "Shall we hear a *rap?*" Sure enough, we had *a rap;* for back came the Examiner with a note "in its mouth." May it prove "an olive leaf"—an omen that the flood is over, and *terra firma* is once more in sight. The note was in pencil mark on the margin of the returned Examiner as follows:—

"*Have* sent you each No. and the whole of the volume. 'Examine' and see. Notice, some of the numbers were double. You must take that back."

We had *to take* it *back*, anyhow, for the returned Examiner brought it. That is one way to take a thing "back." That is a new idea, for which we acknowledge ourself indebted to the *invisibles*. We say "invisibles," because we cannot say the Spirit World sent it back, or that friend Sunderland did, as the note has no initials to guide us. The last tidings we had from the Spirit World was last June. It was a "*double* number;" and the close of volume two. We continued to senc the Examiner regularly, directed to it, and hoped to have a friendly response; we heard no more from it till the returned Examiner brought the foregoing note Now, if the Spirit World is not dead, let us know by its appearance once more. Our office is open for its entrance. The June number, the last we have seen, had the following announcement:

"We ask for no remittances of money for the third volume, until the first number is issued. And that number will not appear till we receive what is equivalent to three hundred pledges of five dollars each."

From this announcement, and not seeing it any more, we knew not but the Spirit World had become defunct. We intended, by our notice last month, to see if it was yet numbered with the things *that are.* The result is before our readers.

We sympathised with our old friend Sunderland, when he said in the last number of volume 2:—

"I solemnly declare that my connection with this cause has cost me over one thousand dollars, to say nothing of my time and labors for the past year, which have been given gratuitously, as my friends in this city [Boston] know, and will testify, if need be." And when he added—"Shall the good I would do, be prevented by the slanderous representations of thoughtless people, who know nothing of these facts, and who feel no sympathy for the cause to which I have devoted my time, my talents, and my all of this world?" we responded, "That's too bad."

We repeat it now—*it is too bad*, when a man gives evidence by worldly sacrifices of the sincerity of his devotion to what he believes is truth, even though he may be mistaken, to accuse him of money-making, if it is not so. And we believe Mr. Sunderland's declaration in his case till it is *proved* untrue. While we thus sympathise with him in any wrong inflicted upon him, and in his sacrifice of his "all of this world," we cannot but regret that he has been drawn, as we conceive, to the verge of a more fearful loss, viz: his *all in "the world to come."* For we regard the system of spirit manifestations, in itself, as developed in the "*rappings*" in this land, as a Satanic development and delusion that will prepare thousands for perdition and destruction. The developments are calculated to deceive unwary souls, and to draw men from dependance upon God to trust in im-

aginary deities, called "*their loved ones*," who "have *departed into the spirit world.*" These imaginary deities are consulted, prayed to, appealed to, and more earnestly sought after than the Almighty and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Redeemer. This we have abundantly shown in the Examiner the year past. It is "*another* gospel;" concerning which an apostle has said, if "an angel from heaven preach" it, "let him be accursed."

The system is evidently "*devil worship.*" A person in order to a full manifestation to him, must consent to yield himself, "soul, body, and spirit," entirely up to the control of the spirits. In other words, he must be submissive to them; "fall down and worship me" is the spirit of their demands. This point it is easy to prove, though some may deny it. Their mandates must be obeyed, or the penalty is a refusal to hold intercourse with you. But we drop the subject here for the present, or till some further development is made.

———o———

"THE TRUE WESLEYAN."—It is months since our old friend Luther Lee, the editor of the Wesleyan, has noticed us. We expected, however, that Bro. "Tate's Defence" would wake him up, and we have not been disappointed, though he has not mentioned that defence. In the Wesleyan, Dec. 13th, he comes out with a column and a half under the caption of "*To Save that which was Lost*," and "*The Immortality of the Soul proved from the Atonement.*" It might have been our remarks on Prof. Finney's sermon that aroused him; but it matters not what did the work; his slumber is broken. He opens his battery upon us in the True Wesleyan, Dec. 13th, as follows:

"The position has been taken by Rev. Geo. Storrs that as man forfeited his existence by sin, involving the death of the soul, in the sense of the loss of conscious existence, immortality can be obtained only through faith in Christ, the great restorer, and of course, that impenitent sinners who do not believe and receive the benefits of atonement, cannot have immortality, continued being, but must cease to exist. Mr. Storrs opened his first great effort on this subject some years since, as follows:

'To commence, I call attention to what man lost by the fall. In order to understand this, let us look at man prior to the fall. He was a *probationer*. For what? Not for *happiness*—for he had that in *possession*. Nor for *life*, merely, as he was in the enjoyment of that also. I conclude, it was for *eternal life*, figured and set forth before his eyes, by the "*tree of life*"—as *death*, the opposite, was set forth by the "tree of knowledge of good and evil.'

In noticing the remarks of Br. Lee that follow this quotation from our Six Sermons, we will take the form of a *dialogue*. The Wesleyan shall take the lead and the Examiner respond:

Wes.—"The position that man could not have been a probationer for happiness because he was already happy, is unsound."

Ex.—The argument does not say "man *could not;*" but that man *was not* a probationer for *happiness*. We admit, however, that the *reason* assigned is not strictly correct; for man, though happy, *might*, if his Creator pleased, have been on probation for *continued* happiness; but as a matter of *fact* that was not the case; at least, so far as the Mosaic account states.

Wes.—"But Adam may have been a probationer * * * for a higher sphere, and a greater degree of happiness. He was doubtless a probationer for the happiness of heaven, in contradistinction from the happiness of the Garden of Eden."

Ex.—The question is not what he *may* or *might* have been, but *what was it* he was on probation for? Mr. Storrs said, it was not *life merely*, and yet it was *for life;* and this is evident from the fact that disobedience was threatened with the loss of life, or with *death*. Hence it was argued that it was *eternal* life, or a *confirmation* in life, that he was *actually* on trial for. Do you not admit that to be a fact?

Wes.—"He could be in possession of life, while he was a probationer for its confirmation."

Ex.—So you are compelled to admit the principle. When Mr. S. said man was not on probation for life *merely*, we think he spoke intelligibly. Life merely and eternal life are two distinct things. All animal creation has life, but have all animals eternal, unending life? Clearly not.

Wes.—"Life *merely*, means life only, or life and nothing else or besides life. To say that man was not a probationer for life merely, is to say that he was a probationer for life, and for something more than life."

Ex.—Yes, for *eternal* life. That is something more than life merely; and we are glad you see it. This position, then, is not so *unsound* as you had seemed to think.

Wes.—"By life, Mr. Storrs must mean simple existence, or the life which all men possess in common with animals."

Ex.—We are glad you understand that point also.

Wes.—"This is what we believe, viz: that man was a probationer for life in contradistinction from the death which we all die, so that if he had proved faithful, he would never have died. 'Sin entered into the world by one man and death by sin."

Ex.—Exactly so; thus far you have scripture testimony, and it sustains fully Mr. Storrs' position, that an uninterrupted or *eternal life* was the probationary prize.

Wes.—"He was also a probationer for a higher state of existence, in the spirit world, to which he would have been translated at the end of his probation, had he proved faithful."

Ex.—Where is a "Thus saith the Lord" for all this *assumption?* Not a solitary text have you in the Bible for it. No, it is the mere offspring of immortal-soulism, and, like its parent, is a creature of *fancy*.

Wes.—"Mr. Storrs cannot say that he means continued existence, by eternal life, in contradistinction from happiness, and life merely, for he denies that he was a probationer for happiness, because 'he already had that in possession.' For the same reason, then, he could not have been a probationer for existence, because 'he was in possession of' that also."

Ex.—If God had said to Adam, "In the day thou dost sin, thou shalt be *unhappy*," then Adam would have been a probationer for *happiness*, though at present happy; i. e., he would have been a probationer for uninterrupted or *eternal* happiness. Instead of this, his Maker informed the man if he disobeyed, he should *surely die;* hence he was a probationer for an uninterrupted or eternal life; that fact is clearly *expressed;* but it is nowhere thus expressed as to happiness, and that is reason sufficient for Mr. Storrs' position as to what man was on trial for.

Wes.—"The theory of Mr. Storrs is, that man was a probationer for immortality, and that he fell and lost it, or lost the privilege of becoming immortal by sin, and consequently is not immortal, and can never become immortal, in the sense of endless existence, only by being regenerated and saved, through faith in Christ."

Ex.—We are glad that you see "Mr. Storrs'" view is a tangible and intelligible one. What have you to say further of this view?

Wes.—"By this argument he involves the souls and bodies of the wicked in a common death, or loss of existence."

Ex.—Instead of "loss of existence," just say, *loss of life;* for it is clear a thing may *exist* without life. Man did so exist at his creation; for "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground;" but though he was "man," he had not life till afterwards, when his Maker imparted it, "and *man* became a [*nephesh ha-yah*] *living* creature." By sin man lost all claim for conscious existence, or for the continuance of that life his Maker endowed him with at creation; he became subject to death, and so lost the prospect of eternal life.

Wes.—"What Mr. Storrs means by eternal life, more than life and happiness continued endlessly, he must explain, we cannot."

Ex.—You have explained, when you say "life continued *endlessly*," and "that man was a probationer for *immortality*." Is not immortality something *more* than "life *simply*." All animals have life, but there is no evidence that any animal has immortality, or an inherent life, so that they *cannot* die. Why should you darken counsel by words? Mr. Storrs has never said eternal life was something "*more* than life continued endlessly"—that is *immortality*—"neither can they die any more." Is not that something more than the "life *merely*" with which Adam was endowed?

Wes.—"Mr. Storrs denies that man was a probationer for happiness and life merely, and asserts that he was a probationer for eternal life. Eternal life, then, according to Mr. Storrs' theory, does not include happiness, and eternal life and eternal misery, may exist together, and his theory is overthrown by his own statements."

Ex.—Mr. Storrs maintains that man was a probationer for just what the law under which he was placed specifies; and that is clearly *life* without end, or endless life; this is evident from the fact that the penalty of disobedience was *death*. Endless life and endless happiness are manifestly inseparable; for in the very nature of things there can be no pain where there is not a liability to dissolution or death; and we may defy the philosophy of the universe to demonstrate the existence of pain in any living creature where that creature is not liable to death. Eternal life, then, or immortality, *is* something *more* than mere life or happiness, but it cannot exist without the creature is delivered from all liability to pain; therefore, "Mr. Storrs' theory does include happiness," though happiness does not necessarily include eternal life, and "Mr. Storrs' theory is" *not* overthrown by" your misapprehensions. Have you anything more to say about Mr. Storrs' views?

Wes.—"To do him justice, he must mean by life, the life of the body, in contradistinction from the life of the soul, as held by those who believe the soul lives after the body is dead, he holding that man was a probationer for the continued life of his soul as well as body, so that by the fall he has lost the life, that is, the existence of both; that, as the body and soul possess one common life, so both were involved in one common death by the fall.

Ex.—Here is a little confusion, from which, if you were extricated, you would have a true view of Mr. Storrs' position. Substitute the word "*man*" for "*body*" in the first two places where it occurs, so as to make it read *the man;* and then strike out the words "that is, the existence," and let it read, "lost the life of both," and you would "do him justice;" for that is what Mr. Storrs maintains, viz: that man by sin lost his life AS MAN; and not that he was left half alive, and that the largest half—the *sinner* himself—thus escaping the threatening of death.

Wes.—"But waiving all this, we will take Mr. S. at his own word. He says, 'To commence, I call attention to what man lost by the fall.' This is the right place to begin, and the right question to ask, and if it can be proved that man lost the *existence* of his soul by the fall, we will give up the whole argument. But to come soberly to the point, what did man lose by the fall? It cannot be assumed that he lost the existence of his soul, because this is the main point to be proved."

Ex.—We are glad to hear you say a thing "cannot be assumed." Mr. Storrs has never *assumed* that "man lost the *existence* of his soul by the fall;" but he has *affirmed*, and maintained it by "the law and the testimony," that man lost *life*—the life of *the man*—so that whatever was included in the creature man, and went to constitute him *man*, *died*, or was subjected to death. If the *creation* was that of *the man*, so his death was the death of *the same man*, and his Maker made no exception of any part of him. But what do you say he lost by the fall?

Wes.—"He lost his spiritual or moral life, consisting in the favor and image of God, and with this, of course, he lost his happiness. In this sense he died a moral death, and of course he must experience a moral resurrection to be restored; and this death he died without losing the existence of the soul, as all sinners are now dead in this sense; and,

hence, their regeneration does not imply a restoration of the existence of the soul."

Ex.—Remember, Br. Wes., *'it cannot be assumed.'* Where is it said, in the law or testimony that the penalty annexed to the Adamic law was "moral death?" No *assuming* these points. Where is the proof? Go to the Assembly's Catechism and you may find the assumption, and along with it the assumption that "God fore-ordained whatsoever cometh to pass;" but is that proof? Give us a "Thus saith the Lord" for your assertion. Not in one solitary instance in "the law and testimony," by Moses and the prophets, does the phrase *"surely die"* signify a moral or spiritual death, unless this in Gen. 2: 17, is an exception; and if it is an exceution, it is for you to *prove* it—"it cannot be *assumed.*" In every other instance this phrase clearly has the meaning of death literally, and not a moral death. Hence, to talk about "a moral death" and "a moral resurrection," in this relation, is to "speak not according to this word," viz; "the law and the testimony;" of such the Lord saith, "It is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8: 20.

Wes.—"That man did die a moral death is evident from the language of scriptures. St. Paul says to Christians, 'You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.'"

Ex.—What has this text to do with the penalty of the Adamic law? If Paul had said to Christians, You were made dead in trespasses and sins by Adam's transgression, it would have been to your purpose; but there is not the most distant allusion to any such thing. Adam's offence was *one*—his sin was *one;* but the persons spoken of by Paul were dead in trespasses and sins, (plural;) and it was clearly their own and not Adam's of which Paul speaks. Mr. Storrs does not deny but what there is a moral death; but he does deny that being the *penalty* of the Adamic law, and challenge the proof. Where is it? *Where?*

Wes.—"There can be no such thing as a restoration of the soul to existence in regeneration, as Mr. Storrs contends, and his doctrine that annihilation is the negative of a regenerate state, is exploded."

Ex.—"Mr. Storrs contends the soul is restored to existence by regeneration!" "that annihilation is the negative of a regenerate state!" Well, now, Luther, or Br. Wesleyan, you ought to be sent immediately to Rome and take out a patent, for the Pope can't beat that! Such a change of an author's words and sentiments! Will Luther tell us where he finds the sentiments he attributes to Mr. Storrs? When he can find such statements in anything Mr. Storrs ever wrote, we will pledge ourself to find the phrase "immortal soul" in the Bible, a more Herculean task than to build Babel.

Wes.—"If the death by sin, with which Adam was threatened, was the loss of existence, including both soul and body, and involving them in one common death, then the death of the soul in the sense in which sinners are dead in trespasses and sins, would carry with it the death of the body, which is not true, for their bodies live while the soul is dead, in the sense in which it dies by sin, or is dead in sin."

Ex.—Here your logical powers have come short of demonstration. Insert "life" for "xeistence," and you would make a fair beginning. But man lost *life* by sin, and as a *penalty* of law. It does not, therefore, follow that "the death of the soul in" sin "would carry with it the death of the body," even if "loss of existence, including both soul and body" was the penalty of the divine law; because "death in sin" is but a figurative expression to describe *a state* of mind, and is *not* the penalty of law. True you have *assumed* that moral death was that penalty, and thus have contradicted both fact and testimony, for God said to man, "*Thou* shalt die"—"dust *thou* art, unto dust shalt *thou* return," and He has charged you and all others not to say "*any more,* The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." Ezek. 18: 1–4. The moral death, of which you speak, is the state into which men plunge themselves by personal transgression; and is a distinct matter from the penalty of law. But this is a point we will not stop to discuss now, but we are fully prepared to meet you on that point whenever you wish to do so.

Wes.—"If the life and death of both soul and body are so linked together that the body cannot die without carrying the death of the soul with it, and that the soul cannot live without holding the body in life with it; and if it also be true, as Mr. Storrs' theory teaches, that the soul is rendered immortal by regeneration, through faith in Jesus Christ, then a regenerate person could not die."

Ex.—Another pure *assumption.* Mr. Storrs never taught "that the soul is rendered immortal by regeneration;" nor does his "theory" *imply* any such thing. He holds that the life of believers is in Christ; and when Christ is revealed from heaven, the saints put on immortality, and not till then, yet by a moral regeneration *now*—they are rendered meet to receive immortality, eternal life, at Christ's *return.* When a man is *regenerate* in the full and scripture sense—which is not complete till the resurrection, in the last day—he *cannot "die* any more." Luke 20: 35–36.

Wes.—"Man lost his animal existence by sin; that is, the death of the body is one of the consequences of the fall."

Ex.—Man lost *life* by sin. At his creation he was an "animal," nothing but an animal; though of the highest order, and capable of a moral development, which, however, he never made—so far as the law and testimony guide us—till he partook of the forbidden fruit. You talk of "the death of the body" as "one of the consequences of the fall." It was *the man* to whom God said "*thou* shalt die." He did not say the *body* shall die: but *thou—the man.* Whatever went to make up or constitute *man,* was the subject of the penalty, or of the death. If the soul was no part of man, then the soul was not subject to

the penalty, and therefore the soul did not sin, and hence was not and is not "morally dead," as you say.

Will you now just give us your argument to overthrow Mr. Storrs' views, which you draw from the atonement of Christ?

Wes.—"Christ suffered and died, and it took both the suffering and death to make out the atonement. * * * Now, as his suffering was in the place of our suffering, and his death in the place of our death, that we might be called back from the grave, it follows that if our souls are exposed to the loss of existence through sin, so his soul should have lost its existence, or have been annihilated, to have been a ransom to redeem us from annihilation; but his soul was not annihilated, and therefore annihilation is no part of the penalty of the law, for 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Now, as Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, '*being made a curse for us*,' it follows that annihilation or the loss of the existence of the soul, is no part of the curse of the law, for in this sense Christ was not made a curse for us. It appears to us that this one consideration settles the question, that the soul did not forfeit its existence by the fall, but only its happiness."

Ex.—Now, we have only to use your own *logic* to show that the doctrine of endless misery is false. To do this, we will use your language except the substituted words in brackets, and all will see at once that, in trying to eat up Mr. Storrs, you have devoured your own theory of endless misery. Thus:—

"As Christ's suffering was in the place of our suffering, and his death in the place of our death, that we might be called back from the grave, it follows that if our souls are exposed to [eternal misery] through sin, so his soul should have [eternal misery] or have been [eternally tormented,] to have been a ransom to redeem us from [eternal torments,] but his soul was not [eternally tormented,] and therefore [eternal torment] is no part of the penalty of the law, for 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Now, as Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, by '*being made a curse for us*,' it follows that [eternal misery] or [endless torments] of the soul, is no part of the curse of the law, for in this sense Christ was not made a curse for us. It appears to us that this one consideration settles the question, that the soul did not [become liable to endless torment] by the fall, but only [to death.]"

If this argument is not as *logical* and *conclusive* against the doctrine of endless misery as yours is against "annihilation," then your logical powers will enable you to show its fallacy. Moreover, if the soul is immortal, and eternal misery was the penalty of the law, redemption would have been *impossible*, unless the Redeemer himself suffered eternally, if *substitution* is the true notion of atonement, as your theory maintains. Good bye, friend Wesleyan.

DEATH CESSATION OF LIFE.

BY REV. EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

The positive argument for interpreting the threatening of death held out to Adam, in the absolute sense of cessation of all life, has not been noticed by those who have hitherto appeared in this controversy. It is chiefly derived from the language of Paul in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, and from considerations on the compound nature of man, and on the sense which Adam himself would probably have attached to the terms of the menace.

The ancient Alexandrian and Augustinian figurative sense attached to the term *death* in its application to the soul has been frequently insisted upon of late: and the attempt to evince the necessity of rejecting altogether the system of interpretation which is founded upon the technical distinction between temporal, spiritual, and eternal death, has been received by the learned critics of the Evangelical Magazine, even with mirth and derision. In support of the former argument, it may be observed that theologians are much divided as to the number and kinds of deaths which passed upon Adam and his posterity as the result of the fall. The ancient orthodox writers contended for the descent of a triple death upon the head of Adam and of his posterity also. The more lenient critics of modern times have strenuously asserted that only two kinds of death, temporal and spiritual, have been brought upon us by Adam's transgression; while sinners incur the *third* description of mortality, termed in scripture the *second death*, through their own sins. By what canon of interpretation the latter class of theologians, amongst whom may be reckoned Mr. Hinton and Dr. Payne, withstand the assaults of such an assailant as Mr. Haldane, does not clearly appear. *He* asserts that the triple death descended on mankind; *they* firmly pronounce for a twofold mortality as the fatal inheritance. But it seems obvious that by whatsoever canon they at pleasure, for moral and theological reasons, reject one description of death, in discussing the scripture language on man's fallen condition, we are at liberty, and indeed are obliged by that same canon, to reject both the *spiritual* and the *eternal*. If they have a right to say that, although death threatened to Adam signified death temporal, spiritual, and *eternal*, (i. e. everlasting misery,) the death which descended as the inheritance was only temporal and spiritual, the same single term being employed in both cases, surely they have established for us a right to advance a step further, and say, that this whole system of distinctions is arbitrary, is based on no solid foundation, and that wherever we read of death as the result of sin, we are to understand the term in the physical sense of dissolution of man's composite nature. We are of course acquain-

ted with those passages of scripture by which this idea of a *moral death* is supposed to be established; but no attempt has been made to encounter in detail the reasonings in favor of a physical interpretation of the term. "You hath he quickened, (*to you hath he given life,*) who were dead in (or, as Macknight correctly gives it, *dead by*) trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. "She that liveth in pleasure *is dead* while she liveth." 1 Tim. v. 6. In this last passage the original is *zoosa tethneeke,* living, is dead. In both cases, the figure, it is submitted, is in the tense, not in the meaning of the verb. An event yet future by a very common form of speech, is vividly described as already present: just as, contrarily, a past state is described by a term having a present application, in the words. "I saw the *dead,* small and great, stand before God." Exactly in the same manner, I humbly conceive, Paul speaks in the epistle to the Romans: "For I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived *and I died.* And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it SLEW ME," (*apekteinen,*) Rom. vii. 11. "The letter KILLETH," says the same apostle: (*to gramma apokteinei.*) 2 Cor. iii. 6. Now, are our opponents prepared to affirm that the verb *apokteino* (translated *slay* and *kill* in these two passages, and evidently employed by the apostle in explanation of *death* in each case, is capable of being tortured into several significations, physical, spiritual, and eternal? Can we say of a wicked man that he is morally *slain,* spiritually *killed,* as a descendant of Adam, and that he will be *slain* and *killed* to all eternity in the miseries of hell? But if our opponents are not prepared to defend these extravagances of diction, it is necessary to abandon the entire theory of distinctions in the meaning of the term, and to adhere, throughout the canon to a physical interpretation of the threatening of death. Again, it is urged, that to suppose a figure in the tense rather than in the meaning of the word will satisfy the requirements of every passage in which sinners are asserted to be dead in, or by, their trespasses.

Some light may perhaps be thrown upon the nature of the death threatened to Adam and to the wicked, as "the wages of sin," by adducing considerations derived from our Lord's discourses on the life which he came in infinite mercy to bestow. These discourses will be found extending as a galaxy through the heaven of the gospel of John: and it is somewhat singular that reference to them has been generally avoided by one party in this controversy. In order to economize space, the reader is recommended to peruse this gospel at one sitting, from the first chapter to the end of the twelfth. The most prominent feature in these discourses is the promise of EVERLASTING LIFE. Are there any internal indications which may enable us to determine in what sense this phrase is to be understood?—Strangely enough it is the very phrase selected by Mr. Hinton to denote the idea of endless existence. He asks, "Who will *live for ever?*" and the answer which he returns is, the whole human race. In these divine discourses, however, every impartial reader will admit that our Lord limits the bestowment of "*life eternal*" to the righteous.

If now we take as an example the passage commencing with verse forty-seven in the sixth chapter, "*Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life,*" we may say that the term *life* signifies either the literal bestowment of immortality on body and soul, in the sense by us contended for, and to be conferred exclusively on the saints; or else it signifies one of these three things: first, the gift of immortality to the bodies of the righteous; or, secondly, the gift of *holiness* to their souls; or, thirdly, the gift of eternal *happiness* to a nature already possessed of immortality in the soul. That it cannot be intended to signify the communication of immortality to the bodies of the righteous in any peculiar sense, is asserted by our opponents, who hold that this awful bestowment belongs equally to the wicked, and here without doubt the gift of life is spoken of as the special inheritance of the godly. Besides, the idea of the immortalizing of the body alone, by no means fills out the majesty and reiterated urgency of our Lord's expressions. It is something besides the resurrection of the body which the Redeemer here so frequently attributes to his merciful intervention. The "unjust" as well as "the just" are to be raised from their graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." John v. 28, 29. Neither, secondly, can it be that the gift of *holiness* and divine virtue is here intended. Many passages will offer no sense whatever on this supposition. The continual reference to physical ideas of resurrection "from the graves," and to the privilege of "not dying," as the fathers in the wilderness "died," in connexion with the promises of *life eternal* here repeatedly offered, shows that something far more tangible than the theological conception of *moral life* was designed by our Lord. See John v. 25–29; vi. 40–44, 47–58; viii. 51, 52.

Neither, in the last place, can it be that eternal *happiness* was designed here, *apart from the gift of eternal existence* to the compound nature, for as has been alleged above, many passages are deprived of all congruous signification by such a hypothesis. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof *and not die,*" v. 47. "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have *everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last*

day." John v. 40. To what purpose are these physical references, if the *life* intended were solely the happiness of a nature already immortal, "an heir of indestructible existence?" Will it be said that the life spoken of is resurrection of the body, *and* eternal happiness of the soul already immortal? then how shall we understand the words, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have *no life* in you?" vi. 53; for according to our opponents, *the wicked* WILL *be raised from the dead* to an eternal existence in the body, and this is quite sufficient to show the inadequacy and inconsistency of the proposed interpretation.

Indeed there is no interpretation which will carry us simply and easily through the gospel of John, except that which affixes to the phrase *eternal life*, the meaning of indestructible *existence* in the compound nature of body and soul; of course a happy existence, for it is the sole privilege of the saints in glory. In vindication of this interpretation, let it be permitted in conclusion to adduce afresh several passages which have received no attention from the advocates of natural immortality, but which appear to be destructive of the popular theory.

John v. 26, "As the Father hath life in himself, (*zoeen en eauto,*) so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here *life* must signify the possession of *eternal existence*, the property of "Him that liveth for ever and ever." Now it is added by our Lord, in chap. vi. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in yourselves;*" (*zoeen en eautois;*) where surely the same phrase stands for the same idea—the idea of immortality. This conclusion is supported by the terms of verse 57, where the Lord says, "As *the living Father* hath sent me, and *I live by the Father*, (*zoo dia ton Patera,*) so he that eateth me, even he *shall live by me*, (*di eme zeesetai.*)

Again, in chap. viii. 51, we find our Saviour engaged in conversation with the Pharisees in the temple, and he assured them that "if a man kept his saying, he should *never see death.* Then said the Jews to him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets," &c. The fact that these Jews did not understand Christ's promise of escape from *death*, through him, metaphorically, but literally and physically, shows that whatever the word may have signified at Alexandria, or within the sphere of the Alexandrian influence, it did not steadily signify in the popular language of Palestine, eternal existence in misery: for, had such been the case, they might easily have understood our Lord's discourse. At all events, it is probable that he would have afforded them that explanation had it been true, instead of permitting them to rest in the literal acceptation of his words. Far from removing the impression as to the meaning of the terms which he had used, he immdiately proceeds to affirm the eternity of his own nature, "Before Abraham was I am," an affirmation which he elsewhere conjoins with the assertion of his power to bestow the "resurrection unto life" upon whomsoever he would.

Once more: in chap. xii. 24, our Lord is represented as thus addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast. "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." For a more extended criticism upon this passage the reader is referred to that work which has been already presented to the public: here it shall suffice to demand of the contrary part a reply to two questions. First, what was it which a man is here represented as "loving?" and secondly, what was it which he would lose if he loved it below, and keep unto life eternal if he hated it here? The straightforward and obvious answer to these questions, carries with it a superabundant defence of the main argument of *Life in Christ.* That main argument, cumulative and complex, has not, I think, been approached, either by the lamented Dr. Hamilton, who is said to have admitted that he had not read the recent productions which advocate opposite opinions, or by any of the minor writers who have appeared on the same side. In the future treatment of some of the details of the scheme there is much advantage to be derived in the way of correction or amendment, from the compositions both of vehemently hostile and of friendly critics. But regarded as a whole, it has not, in my opinion, been shaken, simply because it has not been assailed. If for the future the truly benevolent spirit displayed by Mr. Hinton, and by the writer in the British Quarterly Review, be manifested by all who take part in the controversy, the church of Christ will have no reason to regret the inevitable discussion.

———o———

KOSSUTH AND HIS MISSION.—That Kossuth is a wonderful man none will doubt; and that he has a mission to perform is clear. We are disposed to say but little now. That he is one of a class of agencies to gather the nations, *we* can have no doubt. We have seen the man, and who has not felt the influence of his stirring eloquence? That he is one of the "*knowing ones*" must be admitted by all. His *knowledge* of men, principles, and matters pertaining to governments, is truly amazing. His frankness in expressing his wishes is well calculated to win him popular favor; and averse as our leading politicians are or may be to doing anything governmentally in aid of the cause he advocates, they are too selfish to dare to oppose its being done, if that seems to be the popular will. The masses are moved and will be moved; and this nation can scarcely avoid a collision with some of the European powers who are adverse to Kossuth and his objects.

Our present conviction is, that Rev. 16: 14, points out the work in which he is engaged, "The spirits

of *daimonon*"—not "devils," as in our translation—"*knowing ones*" are to "*go forth* unto the" *basileis*—"*kingdoms* of the earth and of the *whole world*, to gather them to the *battle of* THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY." The spirits of *knowing ones* is not an unmeaning expression. We should expect that just such talents and knowledge as is possessed by Kossuth would be brought to the work here prophesied of, and that the effect would be just what appears in this movement.

If the time has come, as *come it must*, for the "Battle of Armageddon," then will the earth see no more quiet or peace till the kingdoms of *this* world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. Then will all "oppressors be broken in pieces;" the adulterous *woman* of Rev. 17 will have her flesh eaten and she be burned with fire; for this waking up of nations will be in part from *hatred* to that woman who has corrupted the earth with her abominations.

We shall wait for further developments, and watch the movements with interest, knowing as we do that the time is at hand for Jesus our Lord to have the throne of his father David, and for his dominion to be extended over all the earth. That reign is to be a *personal* one, beyond a doubt in our mind.

———o———

STORY OF A DOG.—Theologians claim for man an immortal soul; and part of their argument is based on the fact that man manifests moral qualities which brutes do not possess. Let them read the following and judge whether a dog may not have something that looks very much like what they term a moral quality in man: and if man is immortal on this account, why not the dog also?—at least some of them? We confess that the following account not only shames man as a species, but many professed Christians who do not manifest half the moral, nor half the Christian principle of this dog and his companion: for many of them not only rejoice at the calamities that may befall those whom they regard as their enemies, but "bite and devour" those who have extended to them a helping hand. Let such read and learn, from the fact here related, to humble themselves for that pride of heart which leads them to boast that they are immortal, and for the revengeful spirit they have so often indulged.

"One day a Newfoundland dog and a mastiff, which never met without a quarrel, had a fierce and prolonged battle on the pier of Donaghadee, and from which, while so engaged, they both fell into the sea. There was no way of escape but by swimming a considerable distance. The Newfoundland dog being an expert swimmer, soon reached the pier in safety; but his antagonist, after struggling for a time, was on the point of sinking, when the Newfoundland, which had been watching the mastiff's struggles with great anxiety, dashed in, and seizing him by the collar, kept his head above the water, and brought him safely to shore. Ever after they were most intimate friends; and when, unfortunately, the Newfoundland was killed by a stone-wagon passing over his body, the mastiff languished and evidently lamented his friend's death for a long time."

———o———

FROM S. A. CHAPLIN.

Br. Storrs:—The doctrine of Life and Immortality through Christ alone, obtains comparatively good reception in many localities where I visit. A large church near Plymouth, Marshall county, almost unanimously receive the truth on this subject. I preach for them once a month. The little church in Oswego, where I also labor, rejoice in the gospel faith and hope. Other localities are raising the Macedonian cry. I expect to make quite an extensive tour through the central parts of this State soon, and hope to be made instrumental in disseminating the truth. What a glorious subject for contemplation is the Christian's hope in its constituent objects. Contemplating that the mediatorial work is to abolish sin and death, exterminate evil, destroy every vestige of rebellion from God's universe, and save with an everlasting salvation all those who comply with the overtures of redeeming grace. The coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the dead, the restitution of all things, and eternal life in the kingdom of God, upon the Earth renewed, are set before the child of God, as objects on which he is to rest his desires and expectations, should be subjects sufficient to thrill the emotions of every believing heart. Be of good cheer, Br. Storrs. Continue to show the world that *death comes by Adam*, and *Life and Immortality by Jesus Christ;* that we do not *die* into eternal life, but are resurrected into it: that its form or principle is not from the flesh and blood of corruptible man, but from the Spirit of the incorruptible God, which raised Jesus from the dead; that the home of the Saints is not "beyond the bounds of time and space," but in the "new *earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness." In hope of that better country, let us labor to be found of Him in peace without spot and blameless.

Summit, Ind., Oct. 22, 1851.

———o———

TATE'S DEFENCE.—The remainder of that document we have not yet received. Will Br. Tate forward it soon?

———o———

"PROPHETIC PERIODS."—We have concluded to republish a few articles on this subject, which appeared in the Examiner in 1847. The Examiner was then in *quarto* form, and all the numbers containing the articles were long since used up.

For much of the historical information contained in these articles we are indebted to "*The Times of Daniel*, by George Duke of Manchester," published in London in 1845.

We hope our readers will carefully examine the subject, not as a matter of speculation, but for practical purposes.

BR. JACOB BLAIN suggests the idea of calling on those who have the means, to furnish funds to send *two thousand* ministers of the different denominations a copy of the "Bible Examiner Extra." The cost of that number of the *Extra* will be $50; but the postage having to be *pre-paid*, at *two* cents per copy, would amount to $40 more; and if sent a distance over 500 miles, the postage would be *four* cents per copy. The cost of *enveloping* and *directing* will be an additional item; so that $100 at least would be necessary. If the friends are disposed to meet the expense, we will do the *labor* without charge. Those who approve the object can send the funds, and also give a list of ministers to whom they would like to have it sent.

ADDRESS "*George Storrs*, Philadelphia, Pa." There is no necessity for any one to put the name or number of the street on any communication to us, unless sent by private hands. Anything by mail goes into our Box at the Post Office, and we call there every day. The place of our office is given for the benefit of friends who may wish to call on us.

"THE GOSPEL HOPE."—The Sermon on this subject, by the Editor, in the Examiner for December, we have been requested to issue in a pamphlet. We have concluded to send it out as a *Tract*. In that cheap form it will be likely to be more widely circulated. It will be about 16 pages 18mo., and sold at $1.50 per 100, or $10 per thousand copies. Let us have your orders. One brother has already ordered $10 worth.

"OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN."—See list of Books. Whatever any person may think of the *conclusions* in that work, the information it contains is worth double the price of the book. As to ourself, we are unshaken in the opinion that the Anglo-Saxons are the literal *descendants* of Ephraim, and a part of the "*Lost Tribes of Israel.*"

NOTICES.—"*Odd Numbers*" of the Examiner we cannot furnish for 1848. We have only *six sets* for that year left *in sheets*, and about as many more bound with '49, in one volume, the price of which is $1.50.

R. P. Grant.—The letter was received. *H. Halstead*, C. W. Sent you *Storrs' Miscellany*, and bound *Hymn Book* per mail, pre-paid.

ERRATA.—In Examiner for May, 1851:—On page 67, left column, 5 lines from bottom, for "*revelating*" read *revelations*. Same page, right column, 11 lines from top, for "*insinuation*" read *instruction*. On page 68, right column, 35 lines from top, for "*manifest*" read *manifested*.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, &c.
FOR SALE AT BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

The Postage on all these works we have to *prepay* when sent by mail. That amount must be added to the price by all who order them sent in that way. The postage is *one cent* for *each* ounce, or a fraction of an ounce, for any distance under 500 miles: over 500 and under 1500, two cents: over 1500 and under 2500, three cents. We affix the weight to each work, that all may see what the postage is, and send accordingly:

1. "SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist Minister; an argument in *two parts*. This is a work of great power, showing the *Righteous only will live Forever*. 286 pages, 12mo. Price 37½ cts in paper covers. Weight 9 oz.

2. "DOBNEY ABRIDGED."—Or, the *Second Part* of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. It contains all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture*, or *destruction of being*, is the true teaching of Scripture. We put it at the extremely low price of 25 cents. Weight 8 oz.

3. "DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. It is a familiar examination of the question of Immortality conducted in a spirit that cannot fail to interest. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

4. "THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES. A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

5. "SIX SERMONS, by George Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*" To which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on "The Second Death." Price 15 cts. Weight 3 oz.

6. "CAN YOU BELIEVE? By Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A tract of four pages, showing the absurdity of the notion of immortality in sin and suffering. Price 30 cents per hundred.

7. "SECOND DEATH, by Archbishop Whately." A Tract of 8 pages. Price 60 cents per hundred.

8. "THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS." A Tract of 12 pages. Price 75 cents per 100.

9. "THE TWO THRONES, Or, The Throne of God and the Throne of Christ. By George Storrs." This tract goes to show the present position of Christ, and what it will be in the Age to come. Price 2 cents.

10. "TRUE SOURCE OF LIFE, by George Storrs." A Tract of 12 pages. Price $1 per 100.

Of the Tracts it takes about 40 pages to make one ounce.

11. STORRS' MISCELLANY." New edition. It contains the foregoing Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10, bound in 1vol. Price 50c. Wt. 9oz.

12. "THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL, or, Man entirely dependant upon his organization for all his mental and moral powers: By Thomas Read, New York." Price 7 cts. Weight 1 oz.

13. "OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN, or Lectures on Ancient Israel, by J. Wilson," England. This work is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 in paper covers. Weight, bound, 14 oz.; in paper. 9 oz.

14. "TRUTH AGAINST FICTION," or the three last chapters of Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. Price 12c. Weight 3 oz.

On all the foregoing works, one-third discount will be allowed to those who buy to sell again; but in all cases the purchaser *must* add to the price the amount of postage, if ordered by mail.

15. "BIBLE EXAMINER, EXTRA." New Edition. It contains Bishop Whately's remarks on "Second Death"—"Endless Misery," by Bishop Newton—Our "Six Sermons," &c. 16 pages, quarto, and sold at the extreme low price of $2.50 per 100, or 5 cents single copy. Weight 2 oz.

16. "BIBLE EXAMINER" for '48 and '49, bound in one volume. Price $1.50. No discount. Weight 32 oz.

17. "BIBLE EXAMINER" for '50 & 51, bound in 1 vol. Price $1.50. 25 cts. off to paying subscribers for '52, if ordered soon.

18. "CHRISTIAN PSALMODY," bound in plain morocco, 20 cents; in plain gilt 25 cents. No discount, but will be sent free of postage if $1 worth are ordered. Weight 8 oz.

All orders must be addressed

GEO. STORRS, Philada, Pa.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1852. NO. 2.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE LANGUAGE OF PROPHECY.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

One of the principal difficulties in the language of prophecy is the determination of the true limits of the literal, symbolical, and figurative. Perhaps we ought to commence a little earlier, and define the distinction between these three different styles. I would distinguish them thus:—If the language is used in its proper sense, and the idea is conveyed immediately, this I understand to be literal; but though the language be used in its proper sense, if a mediate idea be conveyed, this I suppose to be symbolical; lastly, if the idea conveyed is immediate, but the language is not used in its proper sense, this I apprehend is figurative. For example:

When our Lord says, "Foxes have holes and birds have nests," "fox" is used in its proper sense, and there is no mediate idea; thus the language is literal. But when He says, "Go and tell that fox," the language is used in its proper sense, but there is a *mediate* idea; the idea of a fox arises in the mind, and then by reflexion the attribute of a fox is made characteristic of Herod. But when it is said the floods lift up their voice, or the deep utters its voice, the first idea that arises in the mind is of the ocean, but the language is used improperly; this is figurative.

Symbols are not suited for eloquence, being too cumbrous; the ideas are presented too slowly, which is the very reverse of figurative language; the metaphor in the one instance is applied to the noun, in the other to the adjective; the emotions are immediately roused by the figure, the ingenuity is first exercised in the symbol.

As it is admitted on all sides that no language is so literal as to be entirely devoid of figure, and no prophecies so strictly symbolical as to be without some passages purely literal, it might be supposed that the chief difference amongst students of prophecy, is mainly a question of degree as to how much is literal, symbolical, or figurative. This, however, is not at present the state of the case; that which was only a question of degree has diverged into two distinct and essentially different modes of interpretation, which the advocates of each opinion severally denominate literal and spiritual.

The literal or grammatical method is based upon the assumption that there are certain determinate ideas of things attached to certain words, and consequently, that the words are employed as the medium to convey the ideas which usage and custom have fixed and connected with those words. That it is, therefore, the duty of the interpreter to divest his mind of any preconceived ideas which may influence the meaning he would attach to the words, the ideas not being admitted as ingredients in fixing the meaning of the words, but, on the contrary, the words originating in the mind those ideas which usage has connected with them.

Those portions of the Scripture which are not prophetical convey the same definite ideas which usage has fixed in other writings. And when God has been pleased to reveal to man, and through the instrumentality of man, somewhat respecting future facts, why should we not judge of God's meaning and of the facts which He states, though still future, as we should of man's meaning and of the facts which he states, when writing a history of the past? There is no necessary difference as to the mode of conveying the ideas of the future or the past. A history of the past may be sung in numbers, a prediction of the future may be without poetic ornament or figure; the only essential difference between a record of what has been, and a revelation of what shall be, is the divine foreknowledge, "which vieweth things which be not as though they were."

I will give an illustration: When our Lord spoke of his rising from the dead, the disciples questioned "one with another what the rising from the dead could mean;" and again, when He had most explicitly declared that He was going to suffer, "they understood none of these things." The literalist contends, that whilst these assertions of our Lord were still prophecies, the disciples ought to have received the words according to their literal and grammatical meaning, just as much as that now they have become matter of history, all Christians do so receive them; and that no preconceived ideas respecting Messiah's abiding for ever, should have so possessed their minds as to make the previous idea reflect back upon the meaning of the words, instead of permitting the words in the first instance to impress upon the mind those ideas they were calculated to convey.

This mode of interpretation is no doubt liable to abuse by the extreme of literality;—a man not perceiving the difference between the supernatural and the monstrous, may argue that, because a prediction that a virgin should conceive, has been literally fulfilled, therefore there shall be a beast with seven heads and ten horns; but with the generality of mankind "intuitive consciousness will lead us to decide whether resemblance of properties or identity of substance be intended."

As to the less obvious distinctions between literal, symbolical, and figurative, there will be degrees of difference. "Some," says Waterland, "will fancy the plain and obvious sense, unreasonable and absurd;" the man that will fancy that which is plain and obvious to be unreasonable and absurd, must be himself deficient, either in reason or in faith; but we must not run into the error of supposing the obvious sense to be necessarily the literal sense; when our Lord calls Herod a fox, the sense is obvious, but not literal; some put a literal sense upon "This is my body," but there are many who deny that to be the obvious sense. Some have attempted rules for deciding between the literal, figurative, and symbolical. I think there is a certain tact and discernment in

seizing the spirit of a passage which is superior to any rules that can rigidly be laid down.

The question of spiritual interpretation is more complicated; its advocates should more rigidly define its nature.

Often there is a covert assumption of superiority in the claim for spiritual interpretation, which surely is not correct; for if the literal be the mind of the spirit, that undoubtedly is the most spiritual: our invention is not more free from dross than God's truth. There is also an injustice in the assumption: 'spiritual' is ostensibly opposed to "literal," but the real opposite to "spiritual" is "carnal;" thus the claimant of spiritual views, whilst apparently opposing "literal," does covertly and unconsciously to his opponent, fix the stigma of "carnal" on that which is "literal."

Sometimes *spiritual* appears opposed to *material*, upon which I will quote some excellent observations of Mr. Brown; he speaks of "some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as though separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness. May not," says he, "the gnostic element—of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter—be found lurking beneath it? Certainly, the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of the ground." And if it be no degradation for the Son of God to take it into his own person * * * if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a *spiritual* and *glorious* meet vehicle for the perfected and beautified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and the Lamb, there can be no essential sinfulness and vanity in matter.

I wish I could always approve as fully of Mr. Brown's sentiments; but among the many fallacies which lurk under the term *spiritual*, as describing a peculiar mode of interpretation, one of its most dangerous forms is, as far as I know, peculiar to Mr. Brown. He supposes that the inspired prophets use an expression in one sense, but that the equally infallible apostles apply another meaning to the passage. If this be a sound canon of interpretation, instead of deriving any aid from the New Testament in fixing the direct and immediate scope of the old, it would be calculated to mislead us; instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the quotation in the New Testament, it would blind us.

Sometimes the *spiritual* amounts to nothing more than the undefined. "A spirit passed before my face" * * * "it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image [was] before mine eyes." Sometimes the spiritual means the allegorical, analogical, or anagogetical. The spiritual principle is, in fact, multiform, for its real intention and object is evasion. If the literal system is adopted, certain interpretations must be admitted: and this constitutes the essential difference between the two modes; in the spiritual method, the preconceived ideas form an ingredient in fixing the meaning of the words, instead of the words being the means of suggesting, or channel for conveying, the ideas.

Thus the real intention of spiritual interpretation, and that which is its essential characteristic, is its real danger, for the same principle may be applied to the setting aside of any truth. There is, in fact, an end put to "the assurance of understanding," for the certainty of interpretation is derived from some necessity of signification, and the necessity of signification in words consists in the connection between the words and ideas which has been fixed and established by usage and custom.

"There cannot be a doubt, that, in proportion as sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound understanding of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable grounds will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural species of interpretation adopted and followed." —*Henderson, Minor Prophets*, p. x.

DEFINITIONS.—The study of unfulfilled prophecy is divided into two distinct heads. One, the doctrine concerning the future; the other, the order and series of those events which occur during this dispensation, as introductory to the next.

Passing events leave a very different impression upon the mind according to what the expectation of the final issue may be; they receive their hue from the clouds in the distant horizon. Those who expect the prevalence of the Gospel, see in the efforts of Missionary and Bible Societies, as in the rosy streaks of morn, the dawning of a day, lovely and serene; whereas, others, who believe the year of the redeemed will be ushered in by the day of vengeance of our God, discern that the sky is not only red but lowering, and they expect "a day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Hence, as the development expected has so great an influence upon the aspect of events which are in progress, the consideration of the end should be the first in order, as it is in importance.

It would be difficult to state all the different shades of opinion which are entertained respecting the future, but they may be classed under two principal heads:—

Some expect a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation, at the expiration of which they place the general resurrection and the day of judgment, when Jesus will come and cast the wicked into hell, take the righteous back with Him to heaven, and annihilate the earth.

The opposite opinion is that we are to expect the advent of our Lord at any time; that when He comes, He takes the throne of David, and reigns upon earth for a thousand years; that the saints rise and reign with him; during which time the power of Satan is entirely controlled; though at the end of the thousand years, the evil one will be loosed for a short time; after which the wicked shall be raised and judged; the saints removed to heaven, and the earth destroyed.

The "universal spread of the Gospel" corresponds with the language of the prophet, who says, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." When it is said, this shall be for a thousand years, I do not believe the advocates of this view insist that it shall be for that exact time, neither more nor less; for some make it to mean much more, others perhaps comprise the progress of the Gospel in this period. By saying it will be "before the close of this dispensation," I understand it to be supposed that this state of things will be brought about by means similar to those at present in operation; such as the preaching of the word and the distribution of the Scriptures; but that these efforts will be more enlarged, and probably much more extensively blessed, by an increased outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the change, however, being more or less gradual, not marked by a sudden

and definite transition from one state to another, and without the intervention of any miraculous agency.

With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If, then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch *from* Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ *from* heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he *waited for* them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said that we *wait for* God's Son *from* heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but "the people [gladly] received Christ, *for they were waiting* for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expressions, may be gathered from their use on other occasions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were *waiting* for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would not have descended for a thousand years, they would not have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for," or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Nor are we to suppose the sense of these expressions altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon *waited* for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he supposed the advent was possible at any moment. In like manner when "all the people were *in expectation*, and mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ," surely it implies they were in expectation, because they supposed that the advent of Christ drew near. John sent to ask Jesus whether he was the Christ, or whether they should *look* for another; John looked for the Messiah, knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I understand, with respect to the second coming, the expressions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" implies not only a possibility, but a probability within that time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin: from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true-born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John, therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear that when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be referred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry; on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee," in order to fulfill Isa. ix. 1, 2.

In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father; but this much negative information we may have: until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ's presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when that series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quickly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these

statements, the latter appears to be nearer the truth than the former, because the whole difference may be resolved into the order of events; and in this respect I conceive the second view to be correct. The advocates of both opinions expect glorious things in the latter days; they both acknowledge that Jesus Christ will return to this earth some time or other; but the one party are "waiting for the coming of our Lord"—they are, in the first place, "expecting the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour," and a restitution of all things consequent upon that event; whereas the others are expecting that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord for a thousand years before the day of the Lord: they, therefore, deny the pre-millennial advent of Christ; for one cannot believe two things which are essentially opposed to each other. It would be an abuse of the rational intellect to suppose a man could be in constant expectation of the Lord's advent, and, at the same time, be looking for a thousand years of blessedness to precede that event. A man could not sincerely contemplate the probability of both hypothesis being correct, for one expectation is utterly destructive of the other. We will then assume, as a matter of course, that one who looks for a spiritual millenium is not waiting for the appearing of Jesus Christ.

There are, therefore, two great heads of inquiry—is a spiritual millennium consistent with the character of this present dispensation?—or, on the other hand, is the speedy coming of our Lord a scriptural expectation?—*Finished Mystery.*

UNIVERSALISM.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS.

[Continued from page 6.]

As to wherein God is impartial shall be next considered. Paul gives the Prophet's description of mankind as a whole, naturally, or while under the law, or sin. Rom. 3: 9–18; and in view of it, he asks, are we (who call ourselves Jews) any better than the Gentiles? No—in no wise; for we have before proved both, under sin, (Rom. 3: 9;) and he tells what he means by being under sin, or the law, by describing the state all are in naturally; and the law (inasmuch as it prohibits the indulgence of these vicious propensities) saith these things to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God. 19. Here is common ground—a levelling doctrine—universal brotherhood. Paul said true when he said the animal or natural was first. 1 Cor. 15: 46. Here, and thus, the grace of God finds man. God neither asks nor expects any of his creatures to please him in this state, because the animal or carnal mind inherited from the first Adam is enmity against God, it is not subject to his laws, neither indeed can be, so that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. Rom. 8: 7–8. But if we are led by the spirit we are not under the law, (and if not, we are of course,) Gal. 5: 18; so that everything that is past is freely and impartially remitted through the forbearance of God to all that believe on Jesus Christ or receive the love of the truth, and they are justified fully by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Rom. 8: 23–25. Here at this point, viz: when accountability and responsibility commences, we can cast ourselves on the free grace of God, and can do no other way. For what can any one say of themselves more or better than Paul said of himself and companions when speaking of their past course of life, when he said, For we ourselves also (as well as you) were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceiving, and being deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice, and envy, hateful and hating one another. Titus 3: 3. Needing parental authority and restraint, and when, out of the reach of that, the law to keep them within bounds, just as all do now, else the earth would soon be one vast field of violence, riot and hate, as it was before the flood, before the law was given with the power to enforce them. Rom. 5: 13. Hence the great advantage every way in having the oracles of God committed to us, (Rom. 3: 2,) to teach unerringly the right way, and bring us to Christ, (Gal. 3: 24;) for when any one comes to love God, and submits to be led by his spirit, they can govern themselves. Thus he says, After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. Titus 3: 4–5. Now man can be righteous in the sight of God, and God can be just in justifying the believer—boasting is excluded, (Rom. 3: 25–27,) because no one can do anything to merit this grace, for nothing but faith gives access into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Rom. 5: 2. This faith in the promise of eternal life, which was promised before the world began, (Titus 1: 2;) and its attendant blessings will kindle a hope which will do for those that exercise it what the law cannot, viz: it makes perfect (Heb. 7: 19) by enabling them to purify themselves as God is pure, (1 John 3: 3,) so as to be fit ultimately for this glory.

Here I want to be understood. It will not do to come down on a death-bed and then cast ourselves on the free grace of God, though I would not limit his mercy. Yet it can only safely be done while capable of bearing arms against the foes of right; for after entering the ranks under the captain of our salvation, our fidelity must be tested, our faith must be tried, temptations must be encountered and overcome before one can expect to be promoted to the dignity of being admitted into the society of the pure—and there is no chance for either when past all opportunity. The crown of righteousness, which is eternal life, is promised only to those who have fought well, (2 Tim. 4: 8,) or endured temptation. James 1: 12. We must, like our captain, be made perfect through suffering, not for our sins, which were freely remitted at the outset of the race, but for the sake of right, if need be. No questions are asked any one, who sues to Jesus for mercy, as to the nature of his offences beforehand; his word to supplicants, however vile, is "go sin no more." So we see an impartial administration of favors to any one who will deign to accept them.

A third error is in making no distinction between the transgressions under the first and second, or new testament, or covenant; or in other words no distinction is made between what defiles man and what condemns him to death.

Paul says, because the blood of Christ who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purges the conscience from dead works, (or works which, if persevered in, would bring us to death, for sin, when it is finished, brings forth death,) to serve the living God. For this cause (viz: because it cleanses from all sin) he is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. 9: 14. Now the

question is, in what does transgressions under the first testament consist? We see it cannot be applied to anything exclusively Jewish, from the language, "they which are called," for Gentiles as well as Jews are called, and will receive an eternal inheritance. Jesus tells what these transgressions are when he tells what defiles man, viz: evil thoughts, adulteries, &c. Paul also tells when he quotes the Prophet's description of mankind naturally, or while under sin or the law, (Rom. 3: 10–18,) as he does also in describing his own condition formerly. Titus 3: 3. Jesus said, "whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." Paul says to his Roman brethren, who were converted Gentiles, Rom. 1: 13, "Sin shall not have dominion over you, because ye are not under the law, but under grace." Rom. 6: 14. Here let me observe, much confusion and difficulty arises to prevent an understanding of much of the scripture teachings by imperfect and incorrect notions about the law which is so much talked of, and by not understanding what it is that is done away, and when. The priesthood was then changed, and the laws connected therewith were changed necessarily (Heb. 7: 12) at the same time, viz: when our great High Priest ascended into the heavens, and was honored of God by having the everlasting Priesthood conferred upon him. These carnal ordinances, &c., imposed on thom till the time of reformation, or changing of the priesthood, (Heb. 9: 10,) were blotted out—nailed to the cross. Col. 2: 14–16. They were no longer needed. Christ being come, such shadows and illustrations were senseless. But none of these obselete things were parts or parcels of the royal law, (James 2: 8,) which is the basis of the moral code. Matt. 22: 30. And it is confounding these laws of commandments contained in ordinances (Eph. 2: 15) with the moral code or ten commandments and the principles of right which they involve, which are binding on all his creatures, (inasmuch as love to God and our neighbor can require nothing less,) that does the mischief, for all seeem to be included and swept away together.

To resume. It seems, then, according to Jesus' teachings, we are either servants of sin, or free—or according to Paul, all are under the law or sin, (Rom. 3: 9,) till they submit to be led by the spirit, when they are no longer under the law. Gal. 5: 18. So that it is an individual doing away, Christ being the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Rom. 10: 4. It is "faith that gives access into this grace," and there being but two alternatives or conditions, every individual must be in one or the other of these two cases. In the one case, restraint of some kind, amounting to law, is necessary to keep one in subjection, and the law was added with power to enforce it for this purpose. Gal. 3: 19. The royal law which bound man to love God and his neighbor, (individuals being then amenable to God alone,) was found insufficient except in a few instances to tame man and secure order, as all experience had proved before the introduction of the moral code—hence the necessity of having the royal law defined, and its obligations specified and enforced, Rom. 5: 13; so that those who would not fear, love and obey God, might fear man, and thus society be preserved. The faith that works by love purifies the hearts of those who are led by the spirit, so that laws are not needed to keep them in order, there being no law against the fruits of the spirit. Jesus said all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost or Spirit of Truth shall not be forgiven unto men, neither in this world, neither in the world to come, Matt. 12: 31–32; and he has so distinguished the two worlds that none need make any mistake as to what he means. In this world they marry and give in marriage, and in the world to come they do not. So it is this world yet, though Jerusalem be destroyed. Furthermore, he said, those that did not believe on him were condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on them, for they thereby reject the only means which will enable them to cleanse themselves from those things which Jesus says defiles, and, as a matter of course, would be dangerous members of society if restraint should be removed. In Heb. 10: 26–31, we may learn what transgressions under or against the second covenant we have to fear. Hence we see that the works of the flesh (Gal. 5: 19–21) are transgressions of the first class, and rejecting light and truth those of the second class.

A fourth error is mistaking the danger from which Jesus died to deliver us. Mr. Ballou says, "by the work of salvation we mean entire gradual process, by which, under God, the human mind or soul emerges from a state of imbecility, ignorance and error, sin and guilt, into an exalted state of knowledge, holiness, and happiness."

To say nothing of the fallacy of thinking to save the mind of man without the man—mind being the result of the "inspiration of the Almighty, giving man understanding"—I always thought salvation implied deliverance from some apparent and impending danger, but in this most important of all cases, I see none, without virtually admitting eternal misery, for I see no possible danger of the wicked continuing long in their sins—and the more wicked the less the danger, for they come to their end the sooner. Neither can I see any chance for the wicked to be workers together with God, unless Satan is employed to cast out Satan, because, that nothing remains to be done, if they, too, are raised and are then as the angels, as Jesus said those would be who were worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead. But Jesus said, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 40. The same idea is again expressed in the 54th verse. John said, "The Son of Man was lifted up that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" and again, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 15–16, 36. Here I see danger, and this more than anything else has kept me heretofore from being a Universalist, though I thought perishing meant eternal life in misery. Death, perishing, is to be shunned. And how? Jesus says, if any man keeps my saying, (wherever that man may be found, for God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him,) he shall not see death; and when he talks of death, it is in opposition to the life he came to bestow on the righteous. The righteous sleep. Natural death is not the wages of sin any more than natural life is the reward of righteousness. Let us learn and remember that by means of death on the part of Jesus, the race of man is redeemed from the transgressions under the first testament, seeing they cannot help their nature, which subjects them to death, which amounts to a virtual resurrection for all, else Jesus has not abolished death, or made it null, as Paul said, 2 Tim. 1:

10. So that there remains nothing about natural death now to arouse our fears, seeing Jesus has the keys of death and the grave, and so far as that is concerned, there is nothing about it that is any bar to any one enjoying future life. It being something which can neither be controlled nor averted, as we are descended from him who was of the earth, earthy—from corruptible seed, (1 Peter 1: 23,) and as a matter of course are corruptible—all are freely redeemed from it by him who came for that very purpose, (Heb. 9: 15,) else that would have been the end of all, both good and bad. 1 Cor. 15: 18. In this or natural death none have any choice no more than they had of natural life. But every intelligent being is called upon to choose life and good, and to shun death and evil. Christ is "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Follow that, and it will lead to life—reject it, for the short-lived pleasures of sense, and their end will be like the lower creatures that take the same course, only they follow nature's dictates without choosing their course like man. 2 Peter 2: 12. And the life promised, which is eternal, and death threatened, which is its counterpart, are dependant on our own choice, else language is unintelligible. What fruit, asks Paul, had ye then in those things, whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. Rom. 6: 21. Death unto death. 2 Cor. 2: 16. Or death natural resolved into death eternal. For the resurrection of the wicked being the resurrection of condemnation, and "the wrath of God" abiding on them. Jesus having declared that such shall not see life, there remains no other alternative for the wicked but the blackness of darkness forever. Jude 13.

O! that these two most powerful motives, viz. love of life and fear of death, might occupy their proper place, and be used as levers to help move the ponderous weight of ills that exist towards their eradication. For who can do away with so salutary a restraint to vice as the sacred writers regard death to be, (else they would not warn the wicked to forsake their evil ways to shun it,) and be guiltless? Or who shall presume to add to or change the judgment, which God considers the wicked to be worthy of, (Rom. 1: 32,) into eternal life in misery, and his skirts be clear?

The fifth and last thing I shall notice is mistaking the penalty or confounding those evils which transgressing the laws brings on the transgressor, with the wages of sin, or else confounding the crime with the penalty, by threatening morally dead men as you regard the wicked with moral death.

God loves the world, and giving his Son is proof of it. Infinite wisdom made mankind capable of knowing and choosing good from evil, right from wrong. God says he does not want the wicked to die, but rather they would turn from their evil ways and live. Ezek. 18: 23–32. And as a proof of his sincerity, he has told us plainly what to do to shun it; and his Son told one who asked him what he must do to inherit eternal life, that he must keep the commandments; and in his sermon on the Mount, he told how they must keep them. It must be heart-work, for dishonest purposes, if concealed, the law can take no cognizance of, but God does. Matt. 5: 28–34, 39–44. If, when children, our parents did not restrain us, or if, when we come to act for ourselves, we went astray, ills betided, but these ills though corrective discipline, instead of being the penalty, were loud notes of warning, saying, "turn ye, turn ye, for why will you die? For when lust is conceived, it brings forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, brings forth death." James 1: 15. So that however much may be suffered before death, it is not the penalty or curse, for the wages of sin is death—not moral death, or a continued state of sinning and suffering, for being thus, is why they die.

Now, I leave this with you, and, as an apology for errors, I will just say my study is in the midst of a family of little children, and my time for writing is moments snatched from the time almost exclusively employed in caring for them. If I have not met, or attempted to meet, any fancied objections, it is because I have misapprehended; and if I have said anything that looks reproachful, I have no such feeling. I should be glad, did propriety allow, to notice objections, and also those texts on which your doctrine mainly rests. But I fear to tax your forbearance further. All I ask for this is, the same candor and honesty of interpretation which was evinced in explaining the 6th chapter of Romans, with the exception of your definition of the wages of sin. It being the opposite of eternal life, your explanation of it does not make a very good contrast in point of duration without making eternal misery of it. So it seems to me.

That we may be led into all truth is my earnest desire,

Elmira, N. Y.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

BY THE EDITOR.

The chronology generally received, and found in the margin of our Bibles, makes the time of "Darius, son of Ahasuerus," to be 538 B. C. In the book of Esther, where we have an account of Ahasuerus, the chronology of Esther's marriage is put at 457 or 458 B. C., and the decree which Haman procured for the destruction of the Jews, is made to be 453 B. C.; that would make it *four years after* the decree of Artaxerxes to Ezra, to "restore and to build Jerusalem," according to the received chronology! Can any man, in his senses, believe that? Look at it. The common chronology necessarily makes Artaxerxes and Ahasuerus the same identical king, for they were both reigning in 457 B. C. Then, according to that chronology, this king marries Esther 457, issues his decree to restore and to build Jerusalem the same year, and in 453, issues another decree, by the instigation of Haman, to have all the Jews in his kingdom destroyed! We ask, if such a combination of events is likely to be true? or, what is still more marvellous, Townsend makes all three of these events to happen in 457! Now mark: Darius of the 9th ch. of Daniel is son of Ahasuerus; and yet, strange to tell, his chronology is put at 538 B. C.; that is, 80 years before Ahasuerus married Esther; thus, if we reckon from this marriage, making the son at least one hundred years older than his father, if we allow Darius to be twenty years old when he came to the throne!

It must be manifest to all, that Ahasuerus reigned *before* the Darius of Daniel 9th, and hence Darius, son of Ahasuerus, was not and could not possibly be "Darius the Median," who "took the kingdom" of Babylon; and therefore, Darius, Daniel 9th, must have been Darius Nothus, who, according to Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66, came to the throne about 424 B. C., and fixes the chronology of Daniel 9th at that period, or 114 years later than the present chronology for that chapter. If this be so, it is equally clear there must be an error in the chronology given to the Cyrus of the Scriptures; for Darius Nothus' reign could not have been 112 years after the first

year of the Scripture Cyrus, as it would be if 536 B. C. was the true chronology of Cyrus. We cannot suppose that Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *after* Cyrus, for several reasons: first, it is not likely that a king immediately after Cyrus' decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, to lay the foundations of the temple, and for the Jews' *return*, would have issued the decree for the Jews' destruction; or, if he had, if that decree did not include the Jews in Judea, it seems improbable that there would have been such mourning and resistance, when they might have removed to Judea under Cyrus' decree and been safe. But again, we find *Mordecai* among those who returned from captivity under Cyrus' decree, Neh. 7: 5–7: "I found a register of the genealogy of them that *came up at the first*," says Nehemiah. In that list he names Mordecai as one "who came with Zerubbabel," (see also Ezra 2: 1–2.) Zerubbabel laid the foundation of the temple under Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 3: 8–11, and Zech. 4: 9.) Under the decree of Darius Nothus, or the son of Ahasuerus, the temple was finished. Ezra 6: 15. The true state of the matter seems to be this: the Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *before* the Cyrus of the Scriptures, and is possibly the same as "Darius the Median." Artaxerxes I., who *hindered* the work going forward at Jerusalem, reigned next *after* Cyrus; he was succeeded by Darius Nothus, son of Ahasuerus, at which time Daniel had his interview with Gabriel, as recorded Daniel 9th; the next year after that, Darius put forward the building of the temple, according to Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 5th and 6th,) and the house was finished in the sixth year of his reign, or about 418 B. C. If this be true, then the common chronology makes the decree of Cyrus nearly a century too early; for, at the longest, that decree could not be more than "forty and six years" (see John 2: 20) before the temple was finished, so that Cyrus' decree could not have been earlier than 464 B. C., and probably it was some time later.

It is possible the seventy years *captivity* in Babylon commenced in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, (see Jer. 25: 1, 11, 12.) The "desolations of Jerusalem" in the nineteenth year of the same king, (see 2 Kings 25: 8–10.) The difference between the commencement of the captivity of the Jews, and the commencement of the desolations of Jerusalem in that case, would be 18 to 20 years; the termination of these two events would therefore be equally distant. The 9th of Daniel speaks of "seventy years *desolations of Jerusalem*," corresponding with the 70 years *indignation* against Jerusalem. (Zech. 1: 12.) This latter Prophet shows that indignation was then *ended* (v. 16) in the second year of Darius. (v. 7.) This corresponds with Dan. 9: 2, where it is evident the 70 years desolations of Jerusalem were *ending;* hence, the decree or command to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem, had gone forth about 20 years previous, at the termination of the *captivity;* or, in the first year of Cyrus. Now, as the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, was about 424 B. C., the decree of Cyrus must have been about 444 B. C., if the first year of Nebuchadnezzar is the true date of the commencement of the captivity.

In Dan. 9: 25, Daniel is commanded to "*know* and *understand* that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," &c. Now, if this communication was made to Daniel B. C. 538, according to the common chronology, that is, before *any decree* had been issued, Daniel did neither "know" nor "understand" "the matter;" for he was just as ignorant "where to begin his reckoning" now, as before Gabriel came, and Gabriel still "fails to accomplish his commission." But if we take the first year of Darius Nothus, then the decree of Cyrus, and no other, had gone forth previously; and Daniel had a definite point of time to commence his reckoning for his 7 weeks and 62 weeks, and would therefore "understand the matter," as Gabriel had enjoined upon him to do. Any other view of the chronology leaves Daniel just as much in the dark as before Gabriel's visit. Archbishop Magee, of Dublin, says—"The decree of Cyrus is obviously the command referred to in Dan. 9: 25."

Dr. Wall says of Archbishop Magee—"In strength of intellect, no writer that ever engaged in the investigation has been found his superior," (in endeavoring to reconcile the language of prophecy with the received chronology.) Yet, his mighty intellect found the reconciliation impossible, and so will every other man who has but one object, viz: *to know what is truth*, without regard to theories.

The decree was to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem, therefore it must have been before the first year of Darius; for Jerusalem was at that time inhabited. (See Hag. 1: 4.) In Ezra 4: 12, also, which was before Darius, the building of the city is mentioned. Daniel knew of the decree of Cyrus, and he knew of no other, as we have before remarked, and he had witnessed the return of the Jews, under Zerubbabel, and knew that the "foundations of the temple were laid" by Zerubbabel, and the rebuilding commenced; he must therefore have supposed that the decree of Cyrus was the one Gabriel spoke of. If Gabriel had meant some future and unknown decree, Daniel was rather deceived than informed. When it was demanded of the Jews by what right they proceeded to build the temple, they appealed to the decree of Cyrus, and to no other human authority. (See Ezra 5: 3–16.)

Tertullian, one of the christian writers of the second century, commenced the 70 weeks of Daniel with the first of Darius Nothus, and so did Sulpitius Severus in the fourth century, and both maintained that "Darius, son of Ahasuerus," was Darius Nothus; and the great Joseph Mede dates the 70 weeks from the third of Darius Nothus. Scalliger, Dr. Parry, and Hales, all commence the 70 weeks with Darius Nothus.

How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates? We are of opinion there is "a way of escape" out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes:

First—Making Darius, the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Coresch.*)

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous, and we trust to be able to make this appear before we have done with the Prophetic Periods.

Much confusion also has arisen from not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity;* the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem.* We have already spoken of the *possibility* of the captivity commencing with the *first of Nebuchadnezzar*, but are more inclined to the belief that it commenced in the *eighth* year of that king; and that instead of eighteen or twenty years intervening from the captivity to the *desolations* it was only *eleven.*

Ezekiel 40: 1, shows us that the period at which the *Desolations of Jerusalem* commenced is *eleven years* later than the *Captivity;* thus he says—"In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten." Compare this with Ezek. 33: 21, where he says:—"It came to pass in the *twelfth* year of our captivity—one that had escaped out of Jerusalem came unto me, saying, *the city is smitten.*" Here then we have demonstration that the time that elapsed from the commencement of the captivity to the desolation of Jerusalem was *eleven* years. But this is not the only proof. In 2 Kings 24 chapter, we learn that "Jehoikim became *servant* to Nebuchadnezzar three years," and "then turned and rebelled against him." Jehoikim died and was succeeded by Jehoiachin, who reigned but *three months*, before he was taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar, in the *eighth year* of the reign of the king of Babylon. (See also Jer. 52: 28.) At this time Nebuchadnezzar "carried away all Jerusalem. and *all the princes* and *all the mighty men of valor*—none remained save the poorer sort of the people of the land." Here, manifestly, is the commencement of the 70 years *captivity* in the *eighth* year of Nebuchadnezzar. Then, in 2 Kings, 25th chap., we have an account of the *desolation* of Jerusalem, and it is stated thus, verses 8 to 10—"In the fifth month on the seventh day of the month, which is the *nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar*, king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem; and he *burnt the house of the Lord*, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire—and brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about." Here, then, is a further demonstration that *eleven years* intervened between the captivity and the desolation of Jerusalem; and as 70 years were allotted to *each* of these, we shall find a corresponding termination to the captivity and *desolations.*

The presumption is, that Daniel was among the captives that were carried away with Jehoiachin, in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. We will suppose that he was then *fourteen years* old. If so, he must have been 84 years old in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, for that year ended the 70 years *captivity.* (See Ezra 1: 1.) This proclamation is expressly said to be made "that the word of the Lord by the mouth of *Jeremiah* might be fulfilled;" which prophecy related, specially, to the *time* of Judah's captivity. In the first year of Cyrus, then, the 70 years captivity ended—Daniel lived to see it, and to witness the promulgation of Cyrus' proclamation; though being at that time at least 84 years old, he did not go up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, Joshua, and their associates. Daniel is alive in the third year of Cyrus, as we learn from Dan. 10: 1, which was the next year after "the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid, (see Ezra 3: 8–11,) "in the third year of Cyrus," probably, the news reached Daniel, in Persia, that "the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" (see Ezra 4: 1–5,) were plotting to prevent the work going on, which led Daniel to the "mourning" and fasting for "three weeks," recorded in Dan. 10th ch.

Daniel not only lived to see the end of the 70 years captivity, but also to see the end of the "70 years desolations of Jerusalem," [see Dan. 9: 2,] which must have been eleven years later than the first of Cyrus, or the end of the captivity; so that when the desolations ended, which was in the first or second year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, [compare Daniel 9: 1–2, with Zech. 1: 7, 12, 16,] Daniel must have been at least 95 years old.—The temple, or house of God, was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, at which time Daniel, if living, was 100 years old; it is probable, however, that he had gone to rest before that time.

At the time Daniel had the communication from Gabriel, chap. 9, the *foundation* of the temple had been laid, but the work had been hindered, so that it was still unfinished. And Dr. Townsend, in his chronological arrangement of the Bible, makes this prayer of Daniel, 9th chap., to be during the *suspension* of the rebuilding of the temple; and yet, strange to tell, he falls into the common error of placing that chapter 538 B. C., that is, *before* the temple began to be built, and consequently could not be during the *suspension* of the work.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1852.

APPEARED AGAIN.—We sent the Examiner for January to the Spirit World, as we had done regularly before, and it brought us *eight* numbers of vol. 3, with the words, "*All I have,*" on the margin. Certainly, that is all we could ask. The Spirit World can't do impossibilities, though we would have been glad to look into all the numbers issued by our old friend Sunderland. We feel deeply interested for him; and shall look, till despair sets in, which we hope may never be, for him to return to the "foundation of the apostles and prophets," and to "Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone" of all hope of a future life. Most sincerely do we pray that he may once more realize that Jesus Christ is "the *way*, the *truth*, and THE LIFE," and that "no man cometh unto the Father but by" him. John 14: 6.

"BANEFUL DOCTRINES."—The Baptist Association of Philadelphia, held in this city in October last, sent out a "*Circular Letter,*" prepared by "H. G. Jones." The Association say:

"We may not close this address without referring to a sentiment or moral opinion of recent birth which seems struggling for existence in Europe, and in our own country. It is called 'the destruction or annihilation of the wicked after death," and should it gain increasing vitality or favor, we presume its results may possibly trouble weak and unstable minds, and throw open sluices of infidelity, irreligion, and ruin. Its baneful doctrines are presented to the public in a pamphlet of nearly 300 pages. Yet the view is so entirely unfounded in the Holy Scriptures that we do not believe it can gain many adherents among orthodox Christians. It would doubtless delight the outlawed spirits of darkness to have satisfactory evidence of their entire destruction; though the great Milton is of a different opinion. And Satan himself seems to 'tremble' at the view of his endless woe, and is helped by the Prince of poets to say as evidential of his hopeless case—

> 'Will he so wise, let loose at once his ire,
> Belike through impotence, or, unaware
> To give his enemies their wish, and end
> Them in his anger, whom his anger saves
> To punish endless?"

"Now, if there was any show of evidence for the annihilation of the wicked, it must appear rather strange that the Christians of the first ages never mentioned, or in the least noticed this novel dogma, so pompously ushered to our view in our day, with Hebrew, Greek and Latin criticisms, and learned quotations. But the Bible is so explicit and solemn in its teachings—it so fully sets the endless sufferings of the finally impenitent before its readers, that it does not seem possible that any ground is left for any person to question or mistake."

The "pamphlet of nearly 300 pages" is the work of "H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister, England;" the reprint of which we have circulated widely in this country, and with good effect. We wish the Association had given the name of the work and its author. Perhaps Mr. Jones did; but we understand the "Circular Letter" was trimmed by the Committee before it was adopted.

The letter gives some three or four of the "*so explicit*" texts of "*the Bible*" which leave *no* "ground for any person to question or mistake" the doctrine of "the *endless sufferings* of the finally impenitent." Among these texts is the following, which is put down "Rev. 22: 21," and made to read thus: "*We that are unjust and filthy now, will be after death unjust and filthy still, and ever will remain so.*"

How an intelligent body of ministers could vote upon and sanction such an *addition* to "the Bible," we cannot comprehend—and especially to a book that ends with this awful note of warning—"If any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall apd unto unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Rev. 22: 18. Now, the language which this Association *pretends* to give from "Rev. 22: 21," is not only not there, but is nowhere else in the Bible. *Some* of the words are in Rev. 22: 11, and the reference may be a typographical error; but the *pretended* text, as a whole, is an *addition* to, and *corruption* of, the word of God; and if done knowingly, they ought to hope the doctrine of destruction is true; as every one of those who sanctioned such *addition* are exposed to the plagues written in that book. We will not press this point, though it is painful to think that perishing men should be fed with such corruptions of the word of God. Do men call themselves ministers of Christ, and yet feed his flock with falsehood? and condemn others as preaching '*baneful doctrines*,' because they insist that God means what *he says*, and saith what *he means?* They may attempt to screen themselves by saying, as some do, "That's the *sense* of the text." That may be *their* sense of it, but it is not the *letter* of the text, nor do we believe it is the sense of the Spirit of God. Whether it is or not, they cannot know it is so, and their responsibility as corruptors of "this book" remains.

"Satan himself seems to 'tremble' at the view of his endless woe," says this Baptist Association, "and is helped by the Prince of Poets, as evidential of his hopeless case. Will he so wise, let loose at once his ire," &c.

Here are points *assumed*, which are not true. Satan is to be *destroyed:* and the devils understand this; else why did they ask our Saviour, "Art thou come to *destroy* us?" Mark 1: 24. That their destruction is preceded by torment is true; but the Son of God took flesh and blood * * that * * "he might *destroy him* that had the power of death, that is, the *devil*"—*ton diabolon.* Heb. 2: 14. "His head" is to be *bruised*, which imports *death*—utter destruction, not endless woe.

The Association are not correct in their reference to the "Prince of Poets." If they had quoted David they would have been right: *he* was the Prince of Poets; but then David would not answer their purpose, because he testifies plainly against their assumption. David saith, "All the wicked will God *destroy.*" Psa. 145: 20. "*All* the wicked" includes the wicked one, or Satan. Again, *this* Prince of Poets, speaking by the Spirit of God, saith, "The wicked shall perish; and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; *they shall consume;* INTO SMOKE *shall they consume away.*" Psa. 37: 20. This does not look like *endless woe;* but it does look like turning them into their original elements, so that "the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and *it* shall not be." Psa. 37: 10.

But the Association cry out, "*Annihilation,*" and they affirm, "There is no reason to believe that throughout all the worlds which are dispersed through the immensity of space, a single atom has ever yet been, or ever will be, annihilated!" Marvellous, truly! They go on to say, "No instance has as yet occurred of any system, or portion of matter, either in heaven or in earth, having been reduced to annihilation!" Truly, here is a vastness of knowledge with which few men, besides this Association, have ever been favored! They know what has not been done in "*heaven* and earth!" We would like to put a question to men of such extensive attainments; and it would be as follows:—Gentlemen, did the Almighty God create "all things out of *nothing,*" as the creed saith? If so, has he lost His *power*, by that mighty effort, so that He *cannot*, if he please, reduce all things to their *original state?* Now, do not evade the question. One of two things is certain, either God did not create, as the Creed saith, or He can uncreate, if He please. We care not which ground you take; your own theory is exploded, which ever way you turn. With us it is only a question of what God has *said* he will do. That point settled, we would lay aside all claim to the christian character if we doubted his *ability* to do whatever He saith. Hence if God had said he would *annihilate* the wicked, we would not doubt but what it could and would be done. God has said "all the wicked he will destroy;" and that does not mean he will *preserve* them; for, in the same verse it is said, "God *preserveth* all them that

love him." Thus the saints are to be preserved and the wicked destroyed—yea, "annihilated," if you please.

Another specimen of the profound and astonishing knowledge of the Association is the following sentiment, viz:

"The most ancient historians, such as Berosus and Herodotus, have never mentioned, or even noticed, annihilation, or the extinction of any thing or being which possessed vitality, and especially intelligences as being utterly destroyed."

This notice makes all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes in the waters, and every crawling worm and reptile immortal! Perhaps the Association believe that is the case. However that may be, a more "ancient historian" than those named records that Joshua took a certain city and "smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein he *'utterly destroyed.'*" Joshua 10: 35. Another still more "ancient historian" has "mentioned" the "extinction of beings" who were "intelligent," even their being "utterly destroyed." That the Association may not plead ignorance we will put down chapter and verse, where it reads thus: "So the Lord God delivered into your hands Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people, and we smote him until none was left to him remaining; and we took all his cities at that time * * * and we *utterly destroyed* them * * * *utterly destroying* the men, women and children of every city." Deut. 3: 3–6. It were easy to multiply instances of utter destruction, but these may suffice, remarking only, that Peter saith some men, "as natural brute beasts, * * * shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 2 Peter 2: 12.

The Circular Letter of the Association concludes with this affirmation:

"The Lord assures us in his holy Word, that wicked men are not destroyed at death, or ages after, 'but are turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God.'"

Here the letter makes an effort to sustain their hostility to the destruction of the wicked by an appeal to the Bible; but, as is usual in such cases, are exceedingly unfortunate in their selection. We have shown by the testimony of Moses and Joshua, that *some* wicked men were "utterly destroyed at death;" and of course did not survive "for ages after." In the next place the term "hell," which they quote from Psa. 9: 17, is *sheol* in the original, and never signifies a place of torment, but is expressly affirmed to be a state in which "there is *no knowledge.*" See Eccl. 9: 10, where the same word occurs, though translated *grave;* it is *sheol* in the original. It is a state of darkness, silence, and inactivity, where there is no work, nor wisdom, nor knowledge. See again Eccl. 9: 10. The wicked and "nations," therefore, which are turned into hell, (*sheol,*) are, when that state is *final,* eternally and *utterly destroyed;* yea, "*annihilated,*" as nations and *as men*; that is, they cease to be nations—they cease to be men. We care not whether "their primitive elements" are preserved or not; they are not nations—*they are not men;* and therefore they are utterly destroyed, and cease; or are "as though they had not been." See Obadiah 16.

Here for the present we leave our Baptist Association of Philadelphia, begging them all carefully to read their brother Dobney's work on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," a copy of which we will *give* each of them if they will call at our house 52 Vine street.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

Will the Bible Examiner please examine the following scriptures, and expose, by the Bible, the views I entertain, if they are unscriptural?

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water, * * * who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and dead? For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."—1 PET. 3: 18, 19, 20, and 4th ch. 5th and 6th v.

Now for the *meaning* of this passage—says Peter, "Christ once suffered for us the just for the unjust." When? How? "Being put to death *in the flesh.*" But how "put to death?" How did, how could Christ die? "In the flesh." And what is the import of this? Does "in the flesh" here mean *in sin* or *in a carnal mind?* Had we never seen or heard of the testimonies of the Evangelists, of the life, suffering, and death of Christ, we might understand the import of "put to death in the flesh" here to be "*made a sinner*;" but, with the light which has beamed on us from the sacred testimonies above referred to, we understand that Peter here speaks of the crucifixion of our Lord Christ on Mount Calvary—that "in the flesh" means in the body—the same in which he dwelt among us, and displayed his glory. The death Peter speaks of Christ's suffering for us, we understand the same as Job speaks of in the destruction of his body. It was a putting off of the tabernacle—he expired, he yielded up his spirit.

If such be the import of the Apostle Peter's teaching here by "put to death in the flesh," of the death of Christ; "dead" and "in the flesh" must have the same import in the following 4th and 5th verses, chapter 4. By the "quick," or living, "and the dead," is meant the *living in* the flesh, and the dead *from* it; and by "to them that are dead," is meant persons who have departed this life and are disembodied spirits. Hence it follows that the spirits in

prison, to whom our Lord went and preached the gospel, were not unbelieving Jews nor Gentiles of the Apostles' times; but the antedeluvian dead, who "were formerly disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, in which few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." They were in hades—the unseen world—the receptacle of all the dead, and in prison there. Christ being put to death in the flesh, because then like them, a disembodied spirit, and then conducted by the spirit which afterwards quickened him—made him alive again in the flesh, by re-uniting his soul to the body he left on the cross—he visited their dark abodes—he preached deliverance to the captives, the opening of the prison to them that were bound. Why he did so is plainly declared in the words following: "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Now for the import of this. "To be judged according to men in the flesh," we understand was, as living men in the world, possessed of a body, soul and spirit, after hearing the gospel, are to be judged, justified, or condemned, as they believed and obeyed, or disbelieved and rejected it; and "to live according to God in the spirit," was obeying the gospel and living a life of holiness, as disembodied spirits could obey and live, till the general resurrection, when the souls and bodies of all the just are to be re-united and glorified.

That the above is the true exposition of this passage in Peter, I am confirmed in my convictions by the following additional *proofs:*

1. To the thief, who believed in Christ and confessed and prayed to him on the cross, our Lord said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Both died that day.

2. The Patriarch David uttered a prediction, which Peter quotes and applies in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, thus: "Being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in *hades*, (the unseen world, not hell,) neither did his flesh see corruption." It hence appears that the soul of Christ was to go, and went to *hades.*

3. On the morning of the first day of the week, the third after the crucifixion, in the recorded appearance of our Lord to Mary, he said: "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." From Friday till Sunday morning, the body of our Lord was a lifeless lump of clay, and his soul was in the unseen world. It was not dead. What was it doing there? This we suppose to have been the question which was asked by the primitive disciples of Christ, for they were not Sadducees—they believed in the existence both of angels and of departed, *living, conscious,* disembodied human spirits. And this question was answered to them. The passage in Peter which we have been considering, tells us what that answer was. E. H. W.

Fairfield, Huron Co., Ohio.

[Remarks by the Editor.—We have given place to the foregoing, from a minister who has recently been investigating the immortality question, and who has embraced the view of the destruction of the wicked, but has difficulties in regard to the *unconscious* state of the dead. We wish of course to give a candid examination to all candid objections.

To be "put to death in the flesh," we think, cannot mean simply "putting off" the flesh, or body. Christ was first "in the flesh:" in other words, "the Word was made flesh." John 1: 14. In this state he (viz: the same who was made flesh) was put to death. "*Christ* died" (1 Cor. 15: 3,) not, Christ escaped *out* of the flesh; and thus, in fact, *escaped* death, or did not die at all, only took his leave for a short time of an assumed tabernacle. But "*Christ* died"—not a *part* of him only; for in that case *he* did not die; yet he did die, "according to the scriptures," (1 Cor. 15: 3.) According to that testimony, "his *soul* was made an offering for sin—he poured out his *soul* unto death." Isa. 53: 10–12. Jesus saith, "*My soul* is exceeding sorrowful *even unto death:*" Matt. 26: 38. Again he saith, "I am he that liveth and was dead." Rev. 1: 18. There was a time, then, when he *was not alive;* but now, he adds, "I am alive forevermore." Surely such language is inconsistent with the idea that the essential Christ did not die, or sink for a time into a state in which he was not alive. "*Christ died,*" not *half* died: he "was dead," and therefore was unconscious, for "there is *no knowledge* in sheol." Eccl. 9: 10. *Hades,* in the Greek New Testament, corresponds with *sheol* in the Old Testament, and one *positive* testimony that there is no knowledge in that state, viz: in *sheol or hades,* the state of the dead, must outweigh all *inferential* conclusions to the contrary. As to becoming "disembodied spirits," the phrase is an *unscriptural* one, yet we do not urge that point, only we affirm, if dead men have such spirits, they "*know not anything.*" Eccl. 9: 5–10. And that "in death there is no remembrance of God." Psa. 6: 5. Hence there is no talking or *preaching* while in that state. If such is or has been the case, we need stronger proof than what is afforded by the texts in Peter's first Epistle. The texts, whatever may be their sense, cannot be construed to contradict the *positive* testimony we have presented of the *ignorance* of the dead. Christ did not preach the gospel *in hades;* yet the spirit of God, which raised up Christ from the dead, did preach the gospel *of life* "while the ark was preparing, *in the days* of Noah," to those

who were, in Peter's day, "in prison;" or, as Milton saith, according to the Syriac, "in *sepulchro*," in the sepulchre—i. e., who were now dead. While alive, and God's long suffering of 120 years lasted, the Spirit of God strove with them; but God said, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Gen. 6: 3. When the ark was finished, "the gospel" *of life* was no longer "preached to them," but God withdrew it and gave them up to death, and they are now dead.

As to the notion that the soul and body is to be "*re-united* by the resurrection," we will now only say, the expression is unscriptural and subaersive of the scripture doctrine of the resurrection, which is, that *the man* is raised from the dead. It is *the man* that is dead, not one-half of him. Jesus did not say "Soul and body" of Lazarus *come together again!* No, he said, "*Lazarus come forth.*" If only one-half of Lazarus was in the grave, our Lord called him to come from a place where he was not. But he did not make a mistake, for Lazarus came forth bound hand and foot, in his grave clothes.

On the case of the thief we have written so much, and spoken so often, we shall pass it now by merely remarking, the account of the crucifixion clearly shows that the thief did not die the *same day* that Jesus did; and that, in our mind, if there was nothing else, is sufficient to show that the common notion of his entering Paradise that literal day is erroneous.

As to the "primitive disciples of Christ believing in the existence of departed *living conscious* disembodied human spirits," no scripture evidence of that idea appears to our mind; especially after our Lord's death. During his life they on some occasions manifested a belief in the *embodiment* of human departed spirits, or in the Pharisaic notion of the transmigration of souls. Our Lord has warned us all to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees as well as of the Sadducees: they were the two extremes; the Pharisees believing in the conscious existence of the dead, and the Sadducees denying all future life: both were in error, and both condemned by our Lord for their heresies.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 175, vol. vi.]

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.—1 PETER, 4: 11.

"If any man speak"—*labei*—recount, narrate, recite, declare, teach, or preach—"let him speak as"—according to—"the oracles"—revelation, word—"of God; if any man minister"—distribute, or communicate—"let him do it as"—according to—"the ability"—or power—"which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified"—praised, or, his excellency may be made known, acknowledged, and so he be honored by others—"through Jesus Christ"—who, having ascended on high, has shed down upon his true disciples the Holy Spirit, whereby they are led into an understanding of the word of God, through, or by, the personal teaching of Christ while he was on earth—"to whom be praise and dominion"—power, government—"for ever and ever"—for the ages of the ages; or, for *ever being*—"amen"—so let it be, truth.

Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you. But rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.—12 and 13

"Think it not strange"—surprising—"concerning the fiery trial which is to try you"—the burning trial, by which they and their faith are *assayed*, or tested, as we have remarked on chap. I: 7: it is because they are "beloved"—*dear* to God, that he suffers them to be thus tested; for whom he loveth he chasteneth, therefore be not surprised at the burning trials that you may pass through whatever their character—"as though some strange thing happened to you: but rejoice inasmuch as"—*katho*—according as, in proportion as—"ye are partakers of"—*koinoneite*—sharers in, participators in—"Christ's sufferings." This truly is more strange than the fiery trials themselves; that in enduring them we should be participators, or *sharers in*, the sufferings of Christ. How high the honor; for, "if so be we suffer with him, we shall be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. This expression of Peter shows also that the sufferings of Christ were not "*in our room and stead*," as the common dogma has it; but suffered on account of men, and by their wickedness; but not as a substitute for their sins, or to *pay their debts;* and for such an object none of the followers of Christ do or can suffer; and yet they are partakers of Christ's sufferings; and in proportion as they suffer with him, or participate in his sufferings they have reason to "rejoice;" because—"that when his glory shall be revealed"—at the *unveiling* of his glory (see chap. 1) ye may be glad also with exceeding joy"—that ye may rejoice and leap for joy, or exultation.

If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of; but on your part he is glorified.—14.

"If reproached"—censured, inveighed against, reviled, scoffed at—"for the name of Christ"—for bearing the name, or being called by the name of Christ, i. e., for being Christians—"happy"—blessed—"are ye; for the spirit of glory"—*because* of the

glory (spoken of in the previous verse) which is to come upon you—"and the Spirit of God resteth"—abideth—"upon you" now, if you are suffering for the name of Christ. "On their"—your persecutors—"part he is evil spoken of"—blasphemed; for, saith Jesus, "inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it *unto me*"—"but on your part he is glorified:" while you suffer for Christ and after his patient example you honor him, bring credit to his cause, and praise to his name.

But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.—15 and 16.

"Busybody"—one who meddles in other men's affairs; or a seditious person, one that stirs up strife. "But if as a Christian," any man suffer, "let him not be ashamed"—confounded, disconcerted—"but let him glorify"—praise, extol, magnify—"God on this behalf"—in this respect.

For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?—17 and 18.

The first point to be determined here is, what is the meaning of the phrase "*house of God?*" The first time it occurs in scripture is Gen. 28: 17. On a careful examination of the connection, it seems to signify *the place* where God manifests himself in a special manner—where He makes and receives peculiar communications. Hence the Tabernacle, before the building of the Temple, was called "the house of God." Compare Joshua 18: 1 with Judges 18: 31. In Judges 20: 18, it is said, "The children of Israel went up to the house of God, and asked counsel of God," &c. After the Temple was built that went by the name of the house of God: there God was sought, and there he gave answers. This phrase in the Acts and Epistles occurs but three times, viz: 1 Tim. 3: 15, thus—"That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." Here there is no ground for dispute as to its meaning. Next it is found in Heb. 10: 21, "Having a High Priest over the house of God," &c. Here is very little ground for doubt as to its meaning, viz: the church. It next occurs in the text before us; and it is not easy to see how any other construction can be put upon the words here than in the language of Paul; and the construction of the verse shuts us up to that conclusion that Peter means the church, by the house of God, viz; those who *obey* the gospel; as they are contrasted with those who *obey it not.* We now proceed with a direct exposition of the passage. "For"—*oti*—because—"the time"—the appointed time, the fixed definite period—"is come:" the period spoken of by Daniel, viz: the 70 weeks, which were to terminate on "the holy city"—when that should be given up of God, and not at any point in our Lord's ministry, death, resurrection, or ascension. No language can be plainer than that the 70 weeks of Dan. 9th carry us down to the period when the holy city should be delivered up of God to her enemies, at which time the church was to cease her connection with it and flee out; so that a definite time was also marked by our Lord; that time Peter had said, v. 7, was "at hand;" and as it drew nearer the Christians, who testified of that coming judgment and desolation, would be made to suffer more and more, as the wickedness would increase; so their Lord told them it would be—that they should be hated and betrayed by parents, brethren, kinsfolks, and friends; and some of them they should cause to be put to death. These sufferings and trials Peter calls *judgment—krima*—separation; that is, the sufferings that Christians would endure as the final catastrophe drew on would test them to the utmost and separate all from them who could not endure the trial; and hence called a judgment, because it would be a season that would bring out their real character; "and if" such trials await us at this time, "what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?"—"obey not"—will not suffer themselves to be persuaded, obstinately reject the good news of *life*, or will not suffer God to evangelize them. His reference, we cannot doubt, is to the coming fate of the Jews, who had continued to harden themselves, till God was now about to give up their city and themselves to that fearful and awful destruction which befell them within six years after Peter wrote his Epistle, when "wrath came upon them to the uttermost." See 1 Thess. 2: 16. Peter next refers to the fact that the Christians would suffer much prior to that dreadful calamity, yet, as Jesus had given sufficient caution and warning for those who believed his words, such would escape, "be saved," or *preserved*, though they would "scarcely," or but *just be* saved; yet preserved they would be by obeying his word, and fleeing at the given signal, viz: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed about with armies, then know its desolation is nigh;" &c. But if that signal of our Lord was all that saved or preserved the christians, and they had but just time to escape—"where shall the ungodly"—*asebes*—impious—"and the sinner"—*amartolos*—vicious person, one who deviates from the path of virtue—"appear?"—that is, they shall appear nowhere; they shall be *destroyed*, blotted out, disappear.

Though we have given this passage such an interpretation as we believe the truth demands, let us recollect the language of Paul, that "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning;" and again, 1 Cor. 10: 11, "Now all these things happened unto them for *ensamples;* and they

are written for our admonition upon whom the end of the ages are come." "If God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rom. 11: 21. If the Jews were guilty for not obeying the gospel, and as a consequence their entire national polity, civil and ecclesiastical, broken up, their city destroyed, and an awful destruction overtook them, let all of us, who live under what we affirm to be a clearer light than they ever enjoyed, beware that we are not the subjects of those more awful judgments that are, as prophecy clearly unfolds, to be visited on the Gentile nations who have had the gospel, and professed to believe it too, but who, with all their professions, have profaned the name of Christ by unholy living, iniquitous decrees, enactments, and laws which have caused the inhabitants of christendom to groan under civil and ecclesiastical oppression; and which has caused their cries to come up into the ears of God, as did the oppression of Israel in Egypt, and will as surely be visited with judgment as Pharoah and Egypt were destroyed. The time—the age, the period—has come, for those prophecies to have their fulfilment; and judgment has begun at the house of God—the ecclesiastical organizations—and they are being broken; and the righteous will scarcely be saved, or preserved, from the desolations that are coming, and to come, on the wicked rulers in church and state, and the breaking up of all their organizations, preparatory to the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. Rev. 11: 15.

Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit the keeping of their souls to him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator.—19.

This is an important exhortation to all who are called to suffer on account of attachment to Christ, and obedience to his injunctions, following his example. Let such "commit"—intrust—the keeping of their souls"—their persons, themselves, their lives—"to God in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator," thus perfectly imitating their blessed Saviour, who, while expiring on the cross, committed his life into the hands of his Father.

"Deep Distress."—An old and highly esteemed friend, writing us from a distant part of the country, says: "If you feel for one in deep distress, remember me in your prayers." He gives us no information as to the nature of the distress. Another writes us, that he is sorely tried as he never was before; and we may add, as to *ourself*, the exercises of our mind, for some time past, have been the most severe of any period for many years; and we had concluded, before we received the notes from the two brethren above referred to, that there is now or soon would be, a *personal* trial of the faith and reliance upon God, of all who are truly looking for the return of our Lord from heaven, more severe than usual "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth; * * * if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons." Heb. 12: 5–8. Again, when was our Lord's greatest suffering and agony? When was his soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death? When did he sweat, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground? Was it not at the closing up, or *near* the closing up, of his state of trial? Was it not a short time previous to his being glorified? May it not be, then, as his saints draw nearer to the period of their glorification, that they also shall be called to *drink* of his cup and be baptised with the baptism wherewithal he was baptised? Would it be strange if their Master and Lord should thus give them practical and experimental knowledge that they must sympathize with him in his humiliation before they can be prepared to share in his glory? Sufferings and distress will show to ourselves and demonstrate before our Lord whether we love Christ, and his coming and kingdom, more than we love *this present world.* From the latter we must be weaned before we are prepared for the glory of Christ's fellow-heirs. Many of us may painfully find that we were more joined to the world, and the things of this present time, than we were aware. Happy shall we be if the distress and trials *crucifies* us unto the world and the world unto us. No matter from what source the trials come, let us give ourselves to God and we shall be purified by them. But if we fret, murmur, and repine under them, we may suffer loss; or if we do not lose ourselves, the merciful God will have to keep us under the rod all the longer or more severely, to save us from perishing with the ungodly. Yet, we have need to sympathize with one another as *members* of Christ, and to pray one for another. Most sincerely do we say in the language of Paul, "*Brethren, pray for us;*" never did we more feel the need of the prayers of praying souls. May God, the Lord, keep his tempted, tried ones, and guide them safe to life eternal.

An Unanswerable Argument.!—A copy of the Bible Examiner was presented to a Minister of one of the sects in this vicinity a short time since. A few days after he was asked how he liked it. His reply, as we were informed, was, "I looked at the *title*, and put it into the fire where it ought to be!"

Surely, that is an unanswerable argument against the contents of the Examiner! "The Bible Examiner" in the *fire!* Only think of that! It can't speak now! Who can doubt its being a heretic! The ugly thing would *burn!* Did you *burn it up*, neighbor? or is it only *burning and never to be consumed?* If the latter, it's more than a match for you! You can't *annihilate* it, it seems. If you did burn it up, then it is a witness against you, for your puny hand *destroyed* it by the help of fire; and think you the Al-

mighty God cannot "destroy all the wicked" as easy as you can burn a Bible Examiner? Yea, "*all the wicked will he destroy*;" and none so wicked as those who hate light, and refuse to come to the light lest their deeds should be made manifest. Wedded to their traditions, the very name of *Bible Examiner* puts them in anguish. Happy for its editor that these self-styled orthodox men have not yet the power to do to him what the spirit manifested in burning the paper shows they have the will to do. Such arguments are unanswerable; yet from the *ashes* of that martyr paper the world may be more benefitted than from any other labor its destroyer ever put forth, inasmuch as it speaks in thunder tones to certain men who dare not meet an appeal to the Bible.

———o———

ELDER JACOB BLAIN writes from *Pownal, Vt.*, Jan. 12, 1852:—As soon as I can get a list of one hundred ministers in the State of New York, I will send $5, and have the "Bible Examiner Extra" sent them. I hope others will look up lists and do likewise. I am more and more encouraged to believe we shall not have to work in a *corner* much longer; but like the effects of Pope's pebble, circles will enlarge. But Pope's principle of self-love will not stir the stagnant lake. It must be the principle of *benevolence*, and a benevolence strong enough to make a sacrifice of *money* instead of *wishes*. Are there not nineteen brethren more able than myself, to thus supply one hundred ministers with the lectures? Might we not hope that five out of the one hundred would get their eyes open to the truth, and have conscience and moral courage enough to defy popular opinion and persecution? If fifty or one hundred ministers should now come out in the churches, it would make a noise, produce discussion, and unavoidably spread light, which would, in a few years, root up the horrible tradition of endless torment.

"It's a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated, needs but to be seen."

Who else will give $5, so as to send four hundred in New York? And who will move for other States? I will look up names and address for New York in the different denominations. Let gratitude to God, for the joyful light he has given us, inspire us with zeal to dispel the darkness which has spread gloom over the Christian world for "forty and two months," and a little longer. We honor Wilberforce, Delavan and Howard for their perseverance and sacrifices, and we must perceive that we have a much more glorious object to accomplish and a better prospect of success than they. A reproach cast upon our God is to be removed, as well as an evil from our *fellow-men*. The bible (as well as sympathy and reason) is our weapon in the war, and that is mighty to the pulling down of strongholds.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—Our readers will see that Br. Blain is determined to do his part in carrying into effect the scattering of *two thousand* of the "*Bible Examiner Extra*" among ministers of different denominations. The whole cost, as we stated last month, will be about $100, or $5 per hundred copies, including the *postage*, which will have to be pre-paid in all cases. Shall Br. Blain's proposition be carried into effect?

———o———

A QUESTION.—We received the following from an unknown hand, and give it place in our columns. We have concluded to let our *correspondents* answer the question. If several of them will write us on the subject, we will either give all the answers or that which in our judgment is the best; but in any event we shall withhold the name of the respondent; though we must have it in our possession. We shall take this course to avoid personalities and an undue influence from names.—[ED.

Philada., Jan. 20, 1852.

BR. STORRS:—Will some of your correspondents give me an explanation of Luke 20: 34–37, with the doctrine of the destruction of a portion of the human family *after* the resurrection? The text reads, "Jesus answering, said unto them, The people of this world marry and are given in marriage. But among them that shall be honored to share in the resurrection and the other world, there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage, for they cannot die any more; because, angel-like, they are children of God, being children of the resurrection. But that the dead are raised, even Moses hath suggested, calling the Lord, who appeared in the bush, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now, he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for they are all (though dead to us) alive to him."

There are some spoken of here that are denominated *dead*, of whom God is *not* their God. But of those that attain unto the resurrection, they cannot die any more. Can these texts be harmonized with the destruction of the wicked after the resurrection?

MACKNIGHT.

———o———

AN INQUIRY.—*Br. Storrs*:—Can any one of your correspondents favor me with the correct view entertained by the Sadducees and Pharisees on the resurrection? By so doing, and adducing their authority, it will oblige yours, respectfully,

CORRESPONDENT.

Will some of our correspondents respond to the above?—[ED.

———o———

FROM WILLIAM ROWORTH.

New York, Jan. 14, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—I have been very much interested with the Examiner the last year, and hope you may be supported by the friends in holding up the impor-

tant truths it advocates, for I consider the subject of Life and Death equally as important to be preached as the coming of the Lord—the way man is to attain life and escape death; for these are the two prominent truths held up throughout the Scriptures. It is, do this and thou shalt live, refuse and thou shalt die. I am surprised to find so many professing to love the Saviour and his appearing, startled at this doctrine, and think it ought not to be preached, as it tends to divide and scatter the flock of Christ, and, as a ministering brother told me, it was one of the most egregious errors ever preached, and had been the principal means of dividing and scattering those who are looking for the coming of Christ! I say, if preaching the truth divides, amen—so let it be; it shows there is something wrong when preaching the truth has this effect. The Apostle says, "Preach the word," and I suppose he means the whole of it; for all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and the Apostle says it is all profitable, &c.; then, as the Lord says to the prophet Ezek., "thou shalt speak my words unto them whether they wilt hear or forbear." I do rejoice that these truths are being more and more investigated, and many are beginning to see their beauty and harmony. I once fought against them myself, and stood up to support the heathen notion of the immortality of all men, and the endless duration of the torment of the wicked. But I do rejoice the Lord showed me my error, and I trust he has forgiven me for preaching such lies; for God says: "The soul that sinneth *it* shall die." But the popular theology says it shall *not* die, but live in conscious torment forever and ever. My prayer is that the Lord may still support you in this blessed work until he gives you a discharge.

Yours, &c.

———o———

"The Question of Questions, by Moncrieff," in the last Examiner, we ought to have stated, was *original*, written for our paper. We hope the author will give us more of like character; and we again invite Brn. *Dobney* and *White*, of England, to write for the Examiner. And where is our old friend and first acquaintance in England, Dr. Lees, *alias* "Pathfinder," of Leeds? We should be glad to see more on the immortality question from him.

———o———

"The Gospel Hope, *by George Storrs*."—We have now issued this work in a Tract of 16 pages, 18mo. Price $1.50 per hundred, or $10 per thousand copies.

———o———

Elder Tates's Defence, the remainder, is not yet received.

———o———

Dr. Fondey.—Your article shall appear in the Examiner for March. It came too late for this month.

For the Bible Examiner.

ACROSTIC.

Ordain'd of God, to vindicate the truth,
Nor less to justify His ways to man;
With firm and steady pace pursue the track
Assign'd. Arm'd with all-conquering Love—the
Routed foe, with Gideon's sword beat down—
Despoil'd and vanquish'd—glad to quit the field.

Dauntless go on—the victory is sure;
Expect and brave the scoffing jeers of men;
A few short days will terminate the strife,
Rewarded with the crown of *Endless Life.*

Bedew with tears the seed—the harvest will
Repay with rich and more abundant sheaves.
Onward—ten thousand kindred spirits cry
The truth of God is mighty to prevail:
Heaven's blessing hath and will attend your efforts,
Extend the triumphs of long-hidd'n truths,
Reveal'd in plainness—but for men made *creeds!*

Onward—in fearless contest urge your way,
No weapon form'd against you can prevail;
What though sectarian bigotry may rage,
And labor to evade the force of truth?
Rejoice to know your mission from on high
Demands these efforts till your work is done.

Go on, dear brother—arm'd with power divine—
Omnipotence your safe, your sure defence.

Not many links of the prophetic chain,
Or days of toil and conflict, now remain;
Rejoice in hope—our King is at the door;
His weeping saints ere long shall weep no more.
Eternal Life!—how infinite the prize!
Exchange of suffering—for immortal joys!
Despis'd, rejected—joyful onward go,
Till *He the crown of Endless Life bestow.*
His chariot wheels, not distant far, we hear,
Echo'd in sounds that speak his coming near;
Sweet is the hope, the joy, our triumph soon!
To hear the welcome plaudit, of well done;
Our absent Lord will come, nor long delay,
Restore lost Eden, and his sceptre sway.
Moulded and fashion'd like our glorious Head,
No spot or stain of sin, no cause of dread;
Our light afflictions pass unheeded on,
Resign'd to suffer till the prize is won.
Fill'd with the Spirit of our conqu'ring Lord,
Exulting in his strength and promis'd word,
As giants girded for the fight, we go,
Resolv'd through Him to vanquish ev'ry foe.

These scenes of conflict hasten to a close,
Hush'd to a calm—the ruthless storm shall cease,
Exalted far above the reach of foes,
For transient ills, reap endless joy and peace:
O'er all the past our raptur'd thoughts shall range;
Exult and triumph in the mighty change.

Philada., Jan. 3, 1852.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1852. NO. 3.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

For the Bible Examiner.

ETERNAL TORMENT.

"Come, now, and let us reason together."—Isa. 1: 18.

For the investigation of truth, reason has an appropriate office, and hence, Jehovah, as it were, calls men to the exercise of that faculty. He says produce your cause—bring forth your strong reasons—thus furnishing him with certain mental powers, and then so simplifying his august annunciations, that they may be apprehended and appreciated by human reason.

Reason, however, must be made to keep in its proper place. It is to follow, not precede revelation. The man who would exalt it to the highest place, and set it as a judge over revelation, will do well to remember the undeniable fact that the world by wisdom knew not God, and as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his thoughts more lofty than ours.

In bringing reason to bear upon this question, the object is *not* to *decide* the matter by its aid, but taking it for granted that the eternity of torment has been shown to be *unscriptural*, it may also be shown to be unreasonable.

The idea controverted is, that the wicked shall, in a future state, be upheld by the mighty power of God, or else subsist by virtue of their inherent indestructibility, and caused to suffer the most dreadful anguish, and that without intermission or termination. Against this idea we urge several reasons:

I. *Its inconsistency with the justice of God.*

Justice is manifested in a ruler by a proper and righteous distribution of rewards and punishments. It requires of him that he rewards the deserving, and that he inflicts *proper punishment* upon those whose course of life has been contrary to those rules of action by which they are or should be governed. Justice requires that these inflictions shall sustain a due and just relation to the character of the crime. Now, then, it is evident that infinite crimes deserve infinite punishment; and no crime that is not infinite can deserve such punishment. To deny this is to deny that there should be a proportion between crime and punishment.

But it is said that the guilt of the sinner is infinite, because it is the trangression of an infinitely righteous law and against an Infinite Being. To this it may be replied that this no more makes their guilt infinite than an act of obedience to that infinitely righteous law, instituted by that Infinite Being, renders a man infinitely righteous.

Others, to avoid this difficulty, declare that the infinite guilt of the sinner is produced by an infinite or *eternal succession of sinful acts.* That while *in hell* his actions tend constantly to augment his guilt, and thus he is punished eternally for that eternal succession of crimes.

This, it will be seen, is entirely inconsistent with those declarations which teach that man is to be judged according to the deeds done *in the body;* for, if he is thus augmenting his guilt during the interim *succeeding death* and *preceding the resurrection*, he will be judged according to the deeds done out of the body as well as in. But it may be further remarked, in answer to this, that the condition of man at such a time would be utterly inconsistent with man's free moral agency, without which no action can be considered as possessing moral qualities. To illustrate: A king might issue an edict forbidding his subjects to cry aloud, upon pain of imprisonment. Now, we may admit the king's right to enforce this law. But suppose, still further, that the king should, after arresting and imprisoning a thousand of his subjects for violating this law, command that his officers should place the right hand of each of these prisoners in a vice, and by a sudden motion crush them all to pummice, and then make the involuntary cry of anguish which no doubt each of them would utter a crime and pretext for continued imprisonment—repeating the agonizing torture from time to time, and thus causing them to violate the law! All would at once exclaim against the injustice of such a proceeding. But this, cruel and unjust as it may seem, appears to me to be a fair illustration of that view which represents sinners in hell as *"perpetually* swelling their enormous sum of guilt, and still running deeper, immensely deeper, in debt to divine and infinite justice."

In order to sustain this position of the infinite succession of transgressions, it must be proved, first, that there will be a *revealed law* in *hell;* for, where there is no law, there can be no trangression; and, second, that man will be *free* to *act* while enduring the most intense and hopeless anguish. This can never be done, and therefore the infliction of eternal torment upon any portion of the human family cannot be consistent with the justice of God.

II. *Its inconsistency with the Love of God.*

The book of God contains no passage more precious than that which tells us that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but should have everlasting life. Christ also teaches that our Father in heaven is *kind* to the evil and the unthankful. But, says an objector, does not God say He is angry with the wicked every day? I answer, no. The expression *"with the wicked"* is not in the Hebrew; the LXX give an idea exactly opposite, and the Vulgate has it thus: God is a just judge, strong and patient. *Is He angry every day?* We answer, no! He is not angry every day. The Lord is slow to anger and great in power, and will not at all acquit the wicked. God's mercy and love has been conspicuous even in all his judgements. He smote great kings, for his *mercy endureth forever.*

Now, the idea of eternal torment is absolutely inconsistent with the declarations of God's mercy and love. Do men say that God is himself present in hell to see the punishment of these rebels against his

government, that it may be adequate to the infinity of their guilt, his fiery indignation kindles, and his incensed fury feeds the flame of their torment, and this eternally? We answer, HE RETAINETH NOT HIS ANGER FOREVER, *because he delighteth in mercy.*

III. *Its inconsistency with the holiness of God.*

God is displeased with sin. This needs no proof. The bloody sacrifice of ancient times—the constant commands to repentance, and the amazing sacrifice of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, all testify that God abhors iniquity. He *prefers* that man *should not sin.* He says to his rebellious people, "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandment!" And again, "O that my people had hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways!"

The life which God here bestows upon man may be abused or not. Man has liberty of action, which is good; when he sins he abuses the good gift of God, and God is not chargeable with that abuse. His existence is and may be a blessing—he turns it into a curse many times. Not so an eternal existence amid the flames of hell. Existence there must of necessity be a curse. Man will not then have the freedom of thought or action which he here enjoys. He will have no space for repentance nor hope for mercy. Now, is it reasonable to suppose or believe that God, who hates iniquity, who abhors sin, will preserve to all eternity countless myriads of human beings for the sole purpose of *allowing them to sin and causing them to suffer?* Can we suppose that the Almighty God of holiness and truth would address a sinner in this way, "I am of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and because you have sinned against me for a few brief years, surrounded as you were by many incentives to trangression, I will place you where you shall sin against me eternally." Can we believe that God would say to a blasphemer, "because you have cursed your God, because you have dishonored his name, and because I am holy and hate blasphemy, I will place you where your only occupation shall be to blaspheme my name as long as I exist!" Our minds revolt from such an idea as this, so unlike the character of the God of the bible. Far more in accordance with the character of that God is the declaration of his own blessed word, that "All the proud and all that do wickedly shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

But it is said that the wicked will be thus tormented, to show to the people of God and to the whole universe the consequences of disobedience and sin. I reply, then, this cannot be the case, on account of

IV. *Its inconsistency with the happiness of the redeemed.* Suppose, for an illustration, that you were in a royal palace, surrounded by luxury and beauty and glory. Flowers are filling the air with fragrance—forests are waving in the splendid landscape—fountains are pouring forth their bright waters to sparkle in the glad sunlight—sounds of enrapturing melody are wafted on the busy zephyr. Suppose that as you repose here in joy and peace and happiness, you cast your eye without and see in the distance an Indian camp-fire—around it stand the red warriors of the forest, and amid its burning brands and its fiery embers, you see some captives treading round and round their burning pathway. You gaze a moment—you listen to their low, wailing moan, or piercing shriek, and as you look with straining eyes, you recognize among those helpless captives who must tread the fearful circuit of those burning coals, until they fall dead, a father, a mother, a wife, or a sweet child, that you saw but a week ago beaming with health and beauty. Where would be your bliss as this blood-curdling sight rose in the distance before your eyes? What joy could pleasing sights or sweet sounds or lovely friends produce under these circumstances? Would you desire to dwell longer in that fair palace? Nay, a prison would be preferred to *Paradise* if it would shut from your view such horrors as these!

But this fails to convey the remotest idea of the horrors of eternal torment. I know it is said that then all human feelings are to be changed, but I deny that this will be the case. Jesus, while here on earth, wept not only by the sepulchre of his friends, but over the city of his enemies. We are to follow his example, but are we to cultivate emotions of love and mercy all our lives long and then have them torn from our bosom by the hand of God, and our hearts left as hard as an adamant? Nay, verily. I do not say that this change cannot be effected, but I do say that as the act which takes from the tongue the ability to taste bitterness, takes from it also the ability to discern sweetness; as the act which prevents the eye seeing evil, prevents it seeing good; as the agency that incapacitates the ear to hear discord, also incapacitates it to hear melody; so that act which so changes my nature that I am no longer susceptible of sorrow and anguish, renders me no longer susceptible of joy or pleasure. God may make man so that he cannot feel pity for the anguish of others, but if he does so, he can no longer be partaker of others' joys. Now, it is utterly unreasonable to suppose that God will perfect his *meek* and *merciful* and *penitent* and *pitiful* children by *indurating* their hearts until they vie in hardness with the nether millstone! The happiness of the blessed is the result *not* of such a process as this, but it consists in the absence of every evil thing, and the presence of every good thing, and the most perfect capacity for enjoyment imaginable.

Reader if you ever escape the corruptions that are in the world through lust—if you ever sing with the redeemed on Zion's radiant heights—if you ever possess the conqueror's palm, the unfading crown—if you ever enter the pearly portals of the city of the Lord—if the sound of your tread is ever heard within the golden streets—if the music of your harp is ever heard by the still waters of *Life*—in a word, if you are *saved*, think you that you can go and stand and view the wild surgings of the fiery waves, and list to the dread wail of the innumerable damned, and hear the terrific blasphemies that make "the cheek of darkness pale," and the groans that end not, and see those tears that ever fall, but not in mercy's sight, and then recognize among those tortured wretches a friend, a brother, or a child, with whom you lived and walked on earth, and whose soul, it may be, *you* neglected to save. Think amid scenes like this, you could return to the courts of glory, and with these woful accents falling on your ears, sing among the blessed and possess fullness of joy and pleasures forever more? I tell you. *nay.* The memory of that sight would haunt you—those sounds would ring in your ears, and the thought that such anguish and torture was still endured and was to be endured forever, would mar the joys of heaven with a sorrow that the earth knoweth not.

These, then, are some of the reasons that strengthen me in the belief that "all the wicked will God destroy." God is just, therefore men will not be eternally tormented. God is Love, therefore men will not be eternally tormented. God is holy, therefore men will not be eternally tormented. The

saints will be perfectly happy, therefore men will not be eternally tormented. H. L. H.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

BY THE EDITOR.

In our last number on the Prophetic Periods, we asked, "How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates?" We answered as follows:

We are of opinion there is a way of escape out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes:

First—Making Darius, the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Coresch.*)

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous, and we trust to be able to make this appear before we have done with the Prophetic Periods.

We then noticed another point from which confusion arose, viz: The "not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity;* the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem.*" On these points we refer the readers of the Examiner to what we there said. With regard to making Darius the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person, we judge the absurdity and impossibility of that being the case has been sufficiently made manifest.

The point to which attention is first called, now, is, that Cyrus the Great (or *Koshrau*) and the Cyrus of the Scriptures (or *Coresch*) are not the same individual, but two distinct and very different persons.

In the first place, Cyrus the Great did take Babylon at some period of its history, by turning the waters of the river Euphrates; all are agreed in this fact. In the next place, we have no account that Babylon was ever taken but once in that manner. Now, there is not the least particle of evidence in the Scriptures that any Cyrus had anything to do in taking Babylon in the time of Darius, the Median, or the reign of Belshazzar. The Scripture account, to say the least, renders it extremely improbable and absurd to suppose that any Cyrus, and especially one who should be a near relative to Darius, the Median, and his first General, as well as the man who actually took Babylon for that Darius, should not be mentioned in the government of Babylon, which immediately followed under Darius, (see Dan. 6: 1,) but that Daniel, a Jew and a foreigner, should, by this same Darius, be made Prime Minister, instead of this imaginary Cyrus the Great. Besides, it would follow, that if Cyrus had any office in the government, it was a place inferior to Daniel; for Darius was personally administering the government, as Daniel 6th clearly shows. If Cyrus, then, was an inferior to Daniel in the government, he was thrown into the lion's den with all the other presidents and governors who ruled over the land, or he was spared; if either of these events happened to him, it would be strange indeed if the Scriptures should pass over in silence the transaction at the time of its occurrence. We might multiply the improbabilities of supposing that Cyrus the Great, or any other Cyrus, had anything to do in the conquest of Babylon, in the time of Belshazzar, but these are, to our mind, unanswerable; and it is evident that those profane historians, most relied upon in settling the chronology of Cyrus the Great, have made up their account more from *conjecture* than from facts.

That Cyrus the Great did take Babylon by turning the water of the river from its channel is a truth; but *when* did he do it? Not in the days of "Darius the Median." The city, it will not be pretended, was ever taken in this manner but once. It must not be forgotten that kings and princes had, in those days, many names, often; and it would not be possible, always, to determine, by the mere name, what person performed certain actions. That person may be called by one name at one time and another name at another. So Cyrus the Great might have had other names besides that of Cyrus; not unfrequently they changed their own names, or the name of their wise men or princes, to correspond with the names or character of some of their gods; see the case of Daniel and his companions, whose names were changed, or new ones added by their king. Daniel's name was "Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god," says Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 4: 8. Nebuchadnezzar is a name evidently attached to that king, not as his real name, but as a name he has assumed from some of his gods.

We see, then, if a transaction, and that not occurring but once, is attributed to two or more different names, those names must belong to the same individual, and identifies him as the actor in the case. Now, if the turning of the water of the river and taking Babylon by that means, is, by some historians, who are respectable authority, attributed to Nebuchadnezzar, for example, then, if they are not mistaken in that fact, the conclusion would be, Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar must be one, and identical; because, these things were never done but once, and yet Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar acted in this identical affair. Let us now examine this matter a little, for we have room only for a few words here.

Berossus says that Nebuchadnezzar "so far completed Babylon, that none who might besiege it *afterwards* should have it in their power to *divert the river* so as to facilitate an entrance into it." Thus it appears Babylon was taken in the manner attributed to Cyrus, before Nebuchadnezzar reigned, or Berossus was guilty of a great error. If he was correct in his statements, the city had been thus taken prior to Nebuchadnezzar; and if so, the fact is, that Cyrus the great took Babylon prior to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and not in the days of Belshazzar. Nebuchadnezzar, then, reigned after Cyrus the Great, or their persons are identical; it is most likely to be the latter; and then Cyrus the Great, who is the same as Nebuchadnezzar, carried away captive the Jews, and was not their liberator, according to the common notion and chronology, which has made a world of confusion in the interpretation of prophecy.

Diodorus Siculus (Berossus in Cory. p. 39,) informs us that he who built the hanging gardens at Babylon, was Cyrus. L. Vives, in his notes on Augustine's City of God, says: "Bede saith that Cambyses, son of the elder Cyrus, was called by the Jews Nebuchodonosor."

Sir Wm. Jones says: "The Great Cyrus, whom I call, without fear of contradiction, Cai-Khosrau; for that I shall only doubt Khosrau of Ferdouri was the Cyrus of the first Greek historians, and the hero of the oldest political and moral romance, when I doubt that Louis *Quatorze* and Louis Fourteenth were one and the same French King." He then goes on to give his reasons, which are conclusive. Again he

says, in his works, vol. 3, p. 106: "Whatever our chronologers say, it is not easy to conceive that the Jews were delivered by *this* Cyrus. The name Coresh, used by Isaiah, has no affinity with the Persian word Khosrau, and we cannot suppose any corruption of the sacred text; whereas all the Persian writers agree that a prince named Coresh, who was sent by Bahaman, son of Asfundier, to govern Babylon in the room of Baltazar, actually protected the captive Jews, and permitted them to rebuild their temple." Sir Wm. Jones adds: "Our historians, deceived perhaps by the name Cyrus, which the Greeks gave both to Khosrau and to Coresh, have fixed the return of the Jews much earlier than the truth."

The proclamation of Coresh, or Cyrus, in Ezra 1: 1–2, may be considered an objection to the idea that Coresh could be any other than a supreme and independent king. But several things may be noted on that point. First. The language of Coresh, in regard to the extent of his dominions, is his own, and not inspiration. Second. It was not an uncommon thing for an eastern prince, who was appointed by another, to be more powerful than his sovereign. Third. The phrase "all the kingdoms of the *world*," in eastern language, may signify no more than "all the" *land*, or territory concerned in the Jews' return, that being the subject matter of discourse; and that "land" was the land where they were in captivity and the land of Canaan; which "the God of heaven" had placed in the hands of Coresh. Allowance is also to be made for the style of the ancients. See an example in 1 Kings 18: 10, "As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no nation nor kingdom, whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, He is not there, he took an oath of the kingdom and nation, that they found thee not."

We are not to infer from this language of Obadiah that Ahab had actually and literally sent into all nations and kingdoms; but the expression denotes that the inquiry had been of a most extensive character. Bishop Patrick says, "It would be a foolish conceit, from this expression, to attribute anything like universal dominion to Ahab, hence all commentators limit the expression either to the neighboring nations in league with him, or to the ten tribes, or to the nations where he could in reason think that Elijah had hid himself." "Nothing," says Poole, "is more frequent than to understand general expressions with such limitations."

Cyrus the Great never could use the same language that Coresh did without some limitation; for, he certainly never did, literally, possess "all the kingdoms of the world."

The conclusion we arrive at is this: Cyrus the Great and the Cyrus of the Scriptures, are two distinct persons—one living at the commencement of the captivity, the other at its termination. By not understanding this fact, chronologists and commentators have fallen into great confusion, and opened the door to bring discredit on revelation itself, by adopting some of the most absurd propositions, in regard to periods and time, that can well be imagined.

Common Chronology.—We wish to group together a few points that show, to our mind, irresistably, that the common chronology of the times of Daniel and Ezra must be erroneous.

The Decree of Cyrus, by that chronology, is placed B. C. 536.

The second year of Darius, under whose decree the temple was finished, is placed B. C. 520.

See Haggai 1: 1–15, and compare it with Ezra v. and vi. 8–12, 15. The temple, then, was finished in the sixth year of Darius, or B. C. 516.

The common chronology makes the first decree of Artaxerxes, under which Ezra went up to Jeruselem B. C. 457.

That is 59 years after the temple was finished!

Strange, truly, that the commandment to restore (thy people) and to build Jerusalem, should be so long after the temple was finished!

The common chronology places Dan. ix. chap. B. C. 538.

The 70 years "desolations of Jerusalem" were then ending; compare verse 2 of that chapter with Zech. 1: 7, 12, 16. That is, according to the common chronology, *eighty-one* years before the commandment of Artaxerxes: and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five* years before Ezra went up. Thus, that commandment would have been no guide to Daniel; and Gabriel trifled with him in telling *him* to "*know and understand*" a point not yet passed, and to which he gave him no clue by which he could be guided.

THE PRESENT DISPENSATION.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

My first inquiry is, as to the character of this present dispensation.

For the Scriptures to be generally applicable to the condition of believers, it is evident that the Church must be under circumstances similar to those in which the faithful were placed, when addressed by the apostles. They must have the same relation to the world, be called to sustain a similar conflict, and to exercise identical christian graces.

Now the epistles were addressed to churches when composed of individuals, few in number, suffering from persecution, temptation, inward conflict, and outward distress; and all the exhortations, warnings, encouragements, and consolations, are based upon the idea of the Church being in such an aspect.

The expectants of the glorious appearing of our Lord believe that the same relation between the Church and the world will remain, without any material alteration, until the introduction of the new dispensation, and that therefore all the exhortations, warnings, and consolations based upon that idea will continue in their undiluted force, until the sudden and entire change takes place; but those who look for what they call a spiritual millennium, do not expect a distinctly defined transition to the new and perfect age, but a gradual amelioration, through the diffusion of the Gospel, during this present dispensation; hence, according, to their view, all the relations between the Church and the world will be gradually altered, the way to eternal life will become broad, and there will be many to go in thereat.

But how different is the language of scripture! St. John addresses an exhortation to all classes of christians; not only to the babes in Christ, but to those who are strong, and have overcome the wicked one, as well as to the fathers who have known Him who is from the beginning; a charge so solemnly introduced, is, we may be sure, of vital importance. The injunction is, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. It is not, apparently, the material of the world, or the furniture of the world, but the people of the world, that we are warned not to love; that is the most common meaning of *world* in the scripture, and appears to be the sense intended in this passage, because it is so used in the following context: "Therefore the world knoweth us not;" again, it is that world which is subject to "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the

pride of life," predicates which are not suitable to the material of the world, nor to the furniture of the world, but which do characterize the people of the world; and, lastly, the world is here put in opposition to those who do the will of God." "The world," then, in this passage, denotes the people of the world.

St. John continues. "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him; for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." We cannot love opposites; if we love God, we love what proceeds from God, and "every good and every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning;" we cannot then love the world, nor what proceeds from the world, for it is *essentially opposed* to God; the world is wholly influenced by "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life;" for St. John testifies that "*all* that is in the world * * * is not of the Father." Different phases and characters of wickedness may be formed by the predominance of one or other of these evil principles; but by them, in their different modifications, the whole world is actuated.

When St. John speaks of these being the characteristic features of *the world*, he must imply that they belong to the great majority of mankind, and that the christian is the exception. "We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness, or "the wicked one." The same language is invariably used by the other apostles. "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," and on the other hand, the preaching of the cross is folly to those who seek after the wisdom of the *world.* Conversion is described as "escaping the corruption which is in the *world* through lust:" and one grand feature of pure religion consists in "keeping oneself unspotted from the *world.*" A great part of the conflict to which believers are exposed, is with the *world*, and they overcome, only because greater is He who is in them, than he who is in the *world;* the only ground of trust, therefore, is in the cross of Christ, by which the saint is crucified to the *world*, and the *world* to him.

On the other hand, the love of the *world* causes apostacy, which is evident, because "the friendship of the *world* is enmity with God; whosoever, therefore, will be the friend of the *world*, is the enemy of God;" for, as we have already observed, "the whole world lieth in the wicked [one,]" who is therefore called the "prince of this world," and "the god of this world."

Now, all parties agree that these characteristics of the world will cease when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea. But when all the world are turned to the Lord, it is evident that these descriptions of the world, and the directions to the saints consequent thereon, will become obsolete; instead of its being our duty to "come out from amongst them, and to be separate," we shall be called upon to love them as brethren.

It is therefore very important to decide, whether these precepts will continue in full force during the whole of this age, and be entirely superseded by the introduction of another dispensation; or whether they will gradually fall into disuse by the progressive amelioration of the world. The expectants of Jesus Christ maintain the former, the spiritual millennarians must admit the latter. The passage in St. John's epistle, with which we commenced, will decide the point; we are not called upon to anticipate the improvement of the world, but their removal, "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." At the close of this age, all that offends shall be gathered out of the kingdom; and "then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father." "For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it; but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Hence the whole of this dispensation is characterised as an "evil age," and the end of Christ's death was to take us out of it; "He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us (or take us out) from this present evil world" or "age." Nothing can more strongly mark the character of the whole dispensation.

But if, at any time during this age, the knowledge of the Lord is to be universal, it would then cease to be an evil *age;* and it would be our duty to be conformed to it. St. Paul, however, urges on the Romans "not to be conformed to this age, but to be transformed by the renewing of their minds;" and the necessity of this metamorphosis is evident, because those who walk according to the course of this *age* "are dead in trespasses and sins, walking according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Hence this age of dominant iniquity will continue whilst Satan is "prince of the power of the air," and is energizing in the children of disobedience.

Thus, then, we have learned the extent and the duration of iniquity; until the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet, the whole world will be under the power of the wicked one, and this will be during the whole of this age. We must therefore conclude that the gradual amelioration of the world during this dispensation is not a hope warranted by the Scriptures.

The spiritual account of the relation which the Church bears to the world during this present dispensation, is in exact accordance with what we might expect from the character of the Church during the same period. It is an election out of the world. St. Paul states this in relation to the Jews, and St. James as regards the Gentiles. As to the Jews, there is but a remnant, and a very small remnant, according to the election of grace. It is true that a time will come when all Israel shall be saved, but when all or even most of the Jews are called, the elect can no longer be designated a remnant; the saving of all Israel, moreover, will not be gradual, but sudden. "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

So with respect to the Gentiles, God visits them to *take out of them* a people for his name; the Gospel is to be preached to all nations, but only for a witness, before the end came.

This peculiar standing of the Church in the world, is the occasion of much of the enmity of the world. "Because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." Their being the objects of God's special favor is one of malevolence; being also in their lives preachers of righteousness, they condemn the world, and are therefore hated. "If they have persecuted me," says the Lord, "they will also persecute you," which assertion cannot be confined in its application to the apostles, for St. Paul repeats the same truth with the most universal application. "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." But if all, or even the majority in the world, were brought to live godly in Christ Jesus, who would be the persecutors?

It may, however, be said, that now the Church is

not persecuted. This is only partially true; in some places the persecution is sufficiently bitter to give the stamp of genuine Christianity to the sufferers. And we are not told that all godly people are at all times to be suffering persecution; nevertheless if the believer be not in that state, it should be a subject of inquiry with him whether he is living godly. We are taught to expect in the last days, more of the form of godliness than of its power, in opposition to which it is that St. Paul says, "All who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." I am deeply persuaded that the true character and standing of the Church of God in the world is already greatly lost sight of. What St. Paul says to the Corinthians, with marked disapprobation, might be urged against many of us in this day. "Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us; and I would to God that ye did reign, that we also might reign with you. For I think that God hath set forth us the apostle's last, as it were appointed unto death; for we are made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men. We are fools for Christ's sake, but ye are wise in Christ; we are weak, but ye are strong; ye are honorable, but we are despised. Even to this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffetted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labor, working with our hands; being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat; we are made as the filth of the world and the off-scouring of all things unto this day. I write not these things to shame you, but, as my beloved sons, I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel; wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me." The whole upshot of this discourse seems to be, that this dispensation is not the time of reigning, and that a state of prosperity is a condition of danger, requiring warning; and that such a walk is to be followed as will meet with reviling and defamation from the world. Again, in confirmation of the truth of his doctrine, St. Paul puts a question which would hardly now be considered so unanswerably conclusive. "Then is the offence of the cross ceased?" We have so mistaken the character of this dispensation, that we have lost sight of the privilege of suffering for Christ. Many of us, I fear, so little contemplate these things, that we should think a fiery trial strange, rather than rejoice in being partakers of Christ's sufferings. Many appropriate to themselves, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" And "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" without applying the accompanying test, "As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." But surely if we are not always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, ought we not to inquire whether we are lively, or even living Christians? For the word of God gives no hope of an end being put to persecutions before the coming of Christ. "It is a righteous thing for God to recompense *. * * to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels."

I have hitherto confined myself to those parts of Scripture which are considered more eminently preceptive, because many shelter their indifference to the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom, under the notion that whether true or otherwise, it is not of any great practical importance. I will not enlarge upon other portions of Scripture, but in order to show that they intimate the same truth, I will give one example from each of the three modes of setting forth the future, namely, the types, parables, and express predictions.

The temptations and defections of the children of Israel in the wilderness, were types of what the visible Church is appointed to encounter, as well as of the results of her trials during this dispensation: "Now all these things happened unto them for examples, (types, *margin*,) and they were written for admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come, wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." The statement that the end of the world or age is come upon us, seems to have connexion with the context in this manner; as the events of the wilderness were types, there must be corresponding antitypes; but as the ends of the world or ages are come upon us, we cannot defer the antitypes to any future age. This present is the concluding dispensation, before the Church enters into her rest, during which, therefore, there must be the temptations corresponding with the typical trials in the wilderness, before entering the land of Canaan.

Now, putting by any consideration of the Moabites, and those who did not profess to worship Jehovah, how large a proportion of the professed followers of the Lord fell in the wilderness; how small a number endured unto the end! Out of the multitude that left Egypt, only two entered Canaan. The termination of the forty years was marked by a solicitation to evil which resulted in the excision of all that remained of those who had been delivered from the house of bondage; and was indeed the discriminating trial by which the rebels were purged out of God's congregation. It was the mingling of the Israelites with the Moabites which brought their last snare, as it was the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men which occasioned the flood. How earnestly, then, ought we to watch that we be not amongst those who previously to Christ's second advent, after having escaped the pollutions of the world, through the acknowledgment of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, will again be entangled therein and overcome.

Having given an example from the types, I will proceed to give one from the parables.

The tares are to grow together with the wheat until the harvest; which our Lord explains as denoting the mixture of godly and wicked in the kingdom of heaven—here, I apprehend, denoting the visible Church—until the end. "The field is the world;" the field belongs to the man who sows the good seed; it is the world as belonging to the Son of man, the world in which his kingdom is to be established. "At the end of the age," (not at the destruction of the material of the universe,) "the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom—that kingdom where the good seed was sown, which kingdom is in the world—"all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a flame of fire, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth; then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father;" for "the righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not inherit the earth." I will conclude with one example from the express predictions of the New Testament.

In the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, we are informed respecting the stream of corruption which will flow from the days of the apostles even until the revelation of that power which will be destroyed by Christ at his second advent.

The Thessalonians, it appears, were unsettled in mind, conceiving that the day of Christ was impending, or, I should say, actually commenced. Some commentators suppose that the expression, "the day of Christ," does not refer to the day of the advent of our blessed Redeemer, but to the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet it appears strange how any one could suppose this perturbation of mind should have been produced in the church of God in Thessalonica, by the report of a providential dispensation of God being at hand in Judea; or how the destruction of Jerusalem by the heathen could be called the presence of the Lord to the Thessalonians; or how the congregating of the Roman armies round Jerusalem could be called the gathering of the saints of Thessalonica to Christ.*

The apostle, in urging upon the Thessalonians that their perturbation was groundless, takes occasion to show the different developments of evil, from his days even to the time of the second advent.

There was the mystery of iniquity already working when the apostle wrote: There was also a withholding cause then in operation, which would continue until the revelation of the man of sin. There must have come the apostacy. There must have been revealed the man of sin, who is defined by (1) another designation, "The son of perdition." (2.) Several characteristics. (Ver. 4.)

The revelation of the wicked or lawless one would be upon the removal of that which then hindered: "The wicked one" is to be (1) consumed by the breath of Christ's mouth. (2.) "Destroyed" or put down by "the brightness of Christ's coming."

Hence, as one end of the chain is rivetted to the times of the apostles, and the other to the period of the second advent, it is evident that one or other of these forms or developments of evil is to prevail in the visible Church from the days of the apostles, even until the second advent of our Lord. To which link, then, does the spiritual millennium belong? Is it to be under the apostacy, or under the man of sin?

Our first conclusion, therefore, is, that the expectation of a universal spread of the gospel, during this present dispensation, is incompatible with the essential characteristics of the dispensation itself.

My next head of inquiry shall be, What is the Church's expectation?

* "What share were the christian converts (in Thessalonica) to have in the calamities of the rebellious Jews?" *Simplicius* in Bishop Newton, who adds, "Besides, how should the apostle deny that the destruction of the Jews was at hand, as he himself saith, 1 Thess. ii. 16?"

SPIRIT MANIFESTATIONS.

The following letter, written by Dr. Fondey to a relative, residing in Philadelphia, we suppose is worthy of a careful perusal. He writes:—

Albany, N. Y., Nov. 7, 1851.

Dear H.—As your mother intends returning home soon, and you are anxious to know our opinion in reference to the exercises which you have had while in the interior state, as you term it, I now answer your request. So far (as the spirit of your father, or what represented itself as being such, says,) from my eventually believing in such a mass of delusion as you all seem to have yielded to, I must say that I believe I never shall do so. I pray God that I may never so lose the light which he has given me in His word as to embrace so dangerous and, perhaps in the end, soul-destroying a delusion. I notice that Swedenborgians and Universalists seem to be the most common subjects of it. The reason of this is, I suppose, that they have dipped the deepest into clairvoyance, and have believed Swedenborg's insane ravings, especially those wherein he declares that he had held communion with departed spirits. In these cases the mind seems to have been prepared for the former delusion by previously yielding itself to the belief of the latter. In *your* professed communications with departed spirits, I notice one thing that they require of you and others—they say *you must not doubt the fact we hold communion with you—you must give yourself up to our influence*, thus preparing the mind by this very subtle way to give up the exercise of its reason, and give up the word of God also and every thing that might stand in the way of these spiritual influences, and prevent the delusion from taking hold of you. Mark what I say—I consider this a grand device of *the devil*—a cunning trap laid to get full possession of the mind and render it fit to receive and swallow almost any kind of nonsense. He seems to have led you to believe yourself like the Virgin Mary, highly favored among women—excited your vanity a little, although you try to bear the honor with becoming humility. I deeply deplore your state, no matter how much your health may be benefitted by it. Satan is able to cure disease by Satanic magnetism—he brought disease upon Job, and he is able to cure it, and I consider clairvoyance to have been a grand device of the devil to prepare the way for this interior-state delusion, and thus the better ruin souls. He does this by begetting in those who are the subjects and those who believe in it such an implicit confidence in these communications that they give greater credence to them than to the word of God, and in any matter where the spiritual communications and the word of God come in direct conflict, those who believe in these influences, believe the spirits in preference to the word of God. These influences are common. Le Roy Sunderland is one, formerly a Methodist minister. He now believes the lying spirits in preference to the word of God, and receives a lot of trash coming professedly from the spirits of his little boys as law and gospel. And *you* will be brought to that point sooner or later; the devil may be very cautious with you, and not reveal the cloven foot very soon—but, sooner or later, rely upon it, you will lose confidence in the word of God, and believe the lying spirits in preference—and the child of a father who, if now alive, would almost weep tears of blood at the thought of your danger and your folly in believing such delusions—whose bible was his guide, and who followed its teachings as his rule—that child may yet lose her soul through these damnable devices, these doctrines of devils. A young lady, once a pious girl, but who had become a medium, and had gone through the clairvoyant and interior-state processes, while in the cars and relating her history to a lady, I believe wept in agony as she told of the wretched state in which she then was—she said she had here arrived at such a point that she did not believe in the bible or anything else. And such will be your condition. A brain like yours, that has for years been so diseased that you have been almost insane and ready to destroy yourself, is the very one Satan would select for his operations. And how cunning in him to improve your health, and thus try to assure you that the process through which you are passing must be good and all right, since by it your bodily health is promoted. Ah! Satan can transform himself into an angel of light—he can put you into a fine spiritual state—make you see your father and every one

else but himself—he takes good care not to show himself before the curtain. He can deliver fine essays on morality and religion, and give you good advice—of course he would just now give you good advice, because, if he came out openly and taught bad doctrine, he would expose himself, and the charm be broken.

I would not, for worlds, be in your situation. I consider you as having given yourself up into the hands of the devil, and you need the grace of God to break loose from his power and recover from the snare. God grant that I and mine may never fall into such a horrid delusion. I do not believe I shall do so—and for worlds I would not have C. either; and so far as I can have any influence over her looking to God for help and strength, the devil shall not have power over her. How Mr. C. can believe such stuff I cannot conceive. However, he has been preparing for it by embracing Swedenborg's ravings, and neglecting the study of the bible—and you yourself have neglected the real study of that book, which is a lamp unto the feet and a light unto the path. If you had studied that bible thoroughly, you would have found that our departed friends and relatives could hold no communication with us until the resurrection—that, instead of floating through the spheres and coming down to earth to tell us a mass of nonsense, they are described as being *asleep*, and if asleep, they cannot be very communicative.

Look at passages which show that the *whole* man sinks in death: Gen. 37: 35; Job 3: 12–19; 14: 10–12; 17: 13–16; Ps. 6: 5; 88: 10–12; 115: 17; Is. 38: 18–19; 1 Cor. 15: 32. Also, from 12–24; especially the 18th verse shows conclusively that if there is no resurrection of the body, there is no existence hereafter, and consequently the dead cannot be conscious, and of course there can be no such thing as the spirits of departed friends holding communion with living beings.

Passages showing that the soul goes to the grave and dies: Job 33: 18; Ps. 22: 20; 78: 50; 89: 48; 94: 17; Is. 38: 17; Ezek. 18: 20. Jesus' soul was for a short time subject to death for our sins, and laid in the grave. Ps. 16: 10, compared with Acts 2: 31, &c.; Matt. 26: 38; 1 Cor. 15: 3; and Is. 53: 10; Eccl. 9: 10; and Ps. 146: 4, show that there is no knowledge nor anything else in the grave, and that man's thoughts perish, or in other words, he stops thinking when he dies. In Job 14: 19–22, I find that when man dies he knows nothing of what happens on earth; "his sons comes to honor and *he knoweth it not*, and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." If this be so, how can your father or any other dead person know what happens on earth until the resurrection? In the face of these plain declarations of God's word, how can you believe the lie which the devil, the father of lies, would make you swallow, that the souls of the dead, which are described in the bible as being in the grave, are not there, but floating in the spheres and coming down occasionally to the earth to enlighten humanity and give them that light which it seems in these last days the bible, God's book, is not able to impart. Let God be true, but man and the devil be liars. And after all, what has the pretended spirits of E. and your father, and others, communicated to you? I see nothing wonderful in the substance or language of the revelations. E.'s poetry I consider decidedly poor—much worse than what she could write when she was alive—spirits must retrograde instead of advancing, if her's is a specimen of celestial and improvement. God makes use in these days of no such extraordinary ways of imparting information to man. He has given him a book which clearly marks out the way of salvation—we are commanded to search it, and if you had studied that more, and prayed over it, and had nothing to do with A. J. Davis' imaginations, or Swedenborg's insane vagaries, you would have had a power of *spiritual discernment* that would have put you completely on your guard against these devices of the devil. As I have said, you may yet lose your soul through the delusion—if it is the work of the devil—*and permit your mind to weigh well the question whether it may not be Satanic after all*, you are in his power—your will, your thoughts, and all, are subject to him, and nothing but a determined effort, together with the mighty power of God, can save you. May God interpose in your behalf. May the former prayers of a pious father, whose spirit, instead of roaming among the spheres, is asleep, and will be until the resurrection, be answered in your behalf now, (by the way, you have it that your father was praying in one of your visions—that is real Popery—we have no proof that any one prays in heaven but Christ,) and you be rescued from a snare that I would not for worlds have myself or mine entangled in. The Lord save you, for no one else can do it. This is my ardent prayer.

Yours, affectionately and truly,

JOHN FONDEY.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We fully agree with Dr. Fondey in his view of the Satanic character of the developments, called "*Spirit Manifestations.*" That they are a part and parcel of the "*strong delusions*" into which many will enter, in the last days, we have no doubt. None can have these manifestations, to any extent, who do not resign themselves, "*soul, body and spirit,*" to the will of the spirits. When this is done, the deluded mortal has performed an act of homage to Satan such as he asked of our Lord Jesus. We warn all, once more, to beware of these "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," which an apostle has forewarned us would be in the last days; and to which some would "give heed," and so "*depart from the faith.*" The effect that Dr. Fondey speaks of, that the persons who fall into this snare will ultimately reject the Bible, is inevitable. The revelations of these spirits cannot be harmonized with that book; and however respectful the followers and devotees of these manifestations may at times speak of the Bible, in heart they despise and hate that volume as the greatest obstacle to this Satanic development. It was our lot, a short time since, unknowingly, to be in company with one of the lecturers on the subject. He professed much respect for the bible and Jesus at first, but it was soon apparent that he regarded both as far behind the times in which we live, and as bearing no comparison with the developments and wisdom now being manifested by the spirit-rappers and their adherents. Such a mass of blasphemy, pride and folly may and will, with many, pass for great wisdom; especially with those who have become weary of travelling to the kingdom of God by the way of *the cross*. Some sincere souls for a time will be entangled therein; but we boldly affirm, none can be long ensnared therein who daily

draw nigh to God through the *one Mediator*, Jesus Christ. Christ and Belial cannot both be mediums to and with God. A little time decides the question. If we hold to Christ, as the "*one mediator*," we shall none of us long be connected with these spiritual developments that are now deceiving so many unwary souls. Adherence to these rapping spirits will soon terminate in rejecting Christ, and end in perdition. Few will ever return from this fatal delusion. We regard all such cases as hard bordering on the hopeless: they are fascinated, charmed, bewildered, taken captive by the devil at his will; and nothing short of a miraculous interposition of God can save those who have fully and deliberately given themselves to the influence of these spirits; such an interposition none have a right to presume upon, because not promised; for it is written, "thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God;" and, again it is written, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Those who will not heed these commands will be filled with the fruits of their own way, and perish in their own devices.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1852.

TOUR TO WINSTEAD AND NEW YORK.—Since the last Examiner was issued, we have travelled four hundred miles; and preached during our absence eleven times. We went first to West Winstead, Conn., where we were greeted by an excellent band of brethren and sisters who are *waiting* for our Lord "*from* heaven," [1 Thess. 1: 10,] not expecting to "go to heaven when they die." For this latter expectation there is no gospel *promise;* for Christ's return *from* heaven there are many promises; and "to them that *look* for him shall he appear the *second* time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9: 28. Such are the hopes of the brethren we visited at Winstead. The immediate occasion of our visit to that place was, the "*spirit rappers*" have been there; and the public mind was roused on the subject of the state of the dead, etc. Br. John Howell had given the Rappers some awful *raps* before we arrived; we followed with eight discourses, on immortality and the state of the dead, to large and deeply attentive audiences. The impression, we trust, will prove favorable, and result in the deliverance of some souls from the *ghostly* delusions. Some, there, we know, who had been Universalists, were led to give up that system, and determined to seek and serve God without delay.

We were kindly received and entertained by Br. Miles Grant, who keeps a *pilgrim's* tavern, receiving the Lord's servants joyfully. We abode at his house wholly during our week's stay in Winstead. There we met Br. Howell and Br. Samuel G. Mathewson, both of whom, as well as Br. Grant, are proclaiming "*No eternal life out of Christ*"—and "no future life except by a resurrection at the last day;" and in order to this glorious result, the "*return* of our Lord *from* heaven:" an event believed now to be *near*. Day after day, while with these brethren, we spent in searching the scriptures, and trust much good will result to us all from that work.

The large band of believers in Winstead seem truly united and happy. They have, so far as we could judge, no divisions or strife among them, and it was truly refreshing to be with them. We left with regret, yet rejoicing in the consolation our interview with them had inspired. May the Lord abide with them all, and keep them unto his kingdom and glory.

From Winstead we returned to New York city, a distance of 120 miles. We preached three times on Lord's day, Feb. 8th, in that city, at the corner of Grand and Elizabeth streets, and had the pleasure of seeing many old friends and brethren, to whom we ministered in former years. The day was spent agreeably, and we trust with profit. May the blessing of God rest upon the precious souls with whom we labored there. The next day we returned home, much refreshed in body and mind, rejoicing in the consolation that we had not labored in vain, and that we had gained more strength than we had expended; so that we were stronger to labor on our return than when we left home; for which we praise and bless the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, "our hope."

We hope to receive, before long, the substance of Br. Howell's discourse, exposing the *Spirit Rappers*, and trust it will be both interesting and profitable.

———o———

WORDS OF COMFORT.—A brother in Christ writes: "I cease not to make mention of you in my prayers." These words carried consolation to our heart; and the reflection passed in our mind, "I shall never know in this life how much I am indebted to the praying brethren and sisters;" in faith we could see many of them asking God to keep and sustain us in our work; and our thoughts rose higher to our *Great Intercessor*, Jesus Christ; we saw him interceding in our behalf; and tears of joy and gratitude gushed from our eyes; and our heart melted before God. O! for more praying one for another; and thus manifest our sympathy with Jesus our Lord and head, who ever maketh intercession for us.

———o———

H. A. CHITTENDEN writes us from England, that "A distinguished man of Oxford or Cambridge has recently written a short epilogue, in which he takes our side of the question; or rather the side of the truth." He adds, "They tried to bring him up for heresy, but could not. So says the London Times."

———o———

MATT. 16: 18.—"Hell"—*hades*. "The Greek Testament, with English notes, by Dr. Bloomfield," edi-

ted by Professor Stuart, of Andover, says on this text: "Certain plausible senses have been propounded; but, besides that, they are far-fetched, the constant import of the phrase, both in the Greek Classical, the Old Testament, and the Rabbinical writers, where it constantly means *the grave*, or the entrance into it, the state of the dead, must determine it to mean simply *death*."—*Note, vol.* 1, p. 79.

—o—

THE SADDUCEES AND PHARISEES.—Dr. Neander, in his Church History, vol. 1, pp. 41, 42, says the Sadducees "expressly denied the doctrines of the resurrection, and of the immortality of the spirit, because no such doctrines could be proved from the letter of the Pentateuch alone. These doctrines they reckoned among the foreign additions that had been made to the original doctrines of Moses, from which additions they were wishing to purify Judaism."

The Sadducees were the natural and exact opposites of the Pharisees. These two classes arose sometime after the return of the Jews from Babylon, and before the first advent of our Lord. The Pharisees arose first. "Pride and hypocrisy were their prominent characteristics," says Dr. Eadie, in his Encyclopedia. "They believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again."—*Josephus*, Antiq. III., Book 18, sect. 3.

It will here be seen, that while the Pharisees believed in the natural immortality of the soul, they denied the *re-investment*, with a body, of the wicked. In other words, they seem not to have believed in the resurrection of the wicked. They regarded the resurrection as a *privilege* granted to the virtuous *only*. This idea, however, seems not to agree with Paul's statement of what the Pharisees "allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts 24: 15.

The foundation error of the Pharisees appears to consist in the idea of the natural immortality of the soul; or, of the "immortal vigor of souls." No evidence appears that any such sentiment existed among the Jews till the sect of Pharisees sprung up. Such a sentiment naturally leads to "*pride*," and pride leads to "*hypocrisy*;" just the "characteristics" which Dr. Eadie says were "prominent" with this class of men, and which our Saviour so often charges upon them.

The Sadducees, as opposers of the Pharisees, were ultimately led to the opposite extreme, and denied the resurrection altogether; equally of the righteous and the wicked; and it is likely from the Pharisaic notion of the separate existence of dead men's spirits the Sadducees were led, in opposing that idea to the denial of the existence of *angels* also. The prominent error, therefore, of the Sadducees was the denial of any resurrection, and hence of all future existence: to sustain which notion they were led to reject the existence of angels equally with the existence of human spirits.

Both these sects were in error; not on all points, but in some of the most important points. The Saviour condemns them both, and warns his followers to beware of their doctrines.

The Pharisaic doctrine *virtually*, though not in letter or words, denied the resurrection: for they ascribed the "power to revive and live again" to the "*immortal vigor of souls*." Whether they should have the privilege to *exercise* this immortal vigor depended on whether they had lived virtuously in this life.

The Christian doctrine differs from both these sects, in that it makes *all* future life to depend on a resurrection from the dead; and all *immortal vigor* to be derived from Christ, the second Adam; and to be bestowed upon those who by a patient continuance in well doing seek for it. See Rom. 2: 7; 1 John 5: 11–12; 1 Corth. 15: 13, 17, 18, 32, etc.

—o—

DISCUSSION.—*Are the Wicked Destroyed* AFTER *the Resurrection?*—To this question as stated by "Macknight," in the last Examiner, we have received several responses. We give the two following, in the order they were received.—EDITOR.

Response to "Macknight."—In answer to your question in the Examiner for February, viz: Can Luke xx. 34–37 "be harmonized with the destruction of the wicked after the resurrection?" I reply, yes. And humbly submit the following considerations:

1. There is no direct reference to the destiny of the wicked in the passage. In other portions of the inspired word, there is direct and positive testimony that the wicked will be destroyed after the resurrection. E. G. "For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice. And shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28–29. "And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts xxiv. 15. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Pet. ii. 9. "Have ye not asked them that go by the way? And do ye not know their tokens, that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction? They shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." Job xxi. 29–30. "The Lord preserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked

will he destroy." Ps. cxlv. 20. "Whose end is destruction." Phil. iii. 19. These texts announce the resurrection and destruction of the wicked in *plain terms*. Now, to infer from Luke xx. 34–37, that the wicked will not be raised from the dead, and destroyed, in the face of this divine testimony, seems very like creating a difficulty where none exists.

2. What may seem an *indirect* allusion to the non-resurrection of the wicked in the 35th verse, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more," &c., is balanced by the consideration that the wicked are not to be raised for the purpose of sharing in the "world to come." Consequently, Jesus framed his answer to the Sadducees in precise harmony with the truth that "they that shall be honored to share in the other world, neither marry nor are given in marriage." I cannot conceive how "Macknight," or I, in like circumstances, could have used a different phraseology to meet the occasion.

3. Those denominated *dead* in verse 38, "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living," might have been the Patriarchs, referred to hypothetically. The supposition was that there is "no resurrection." Against this Jesus argues thus: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." "For he is not a God of the dead"—as he would be if there was no resurrection, inasmuch as he called himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after they were dead—"but of the living"—therefore Abraham, Isaac and Jacob must be raised from the dead—"for" they are to "all live unto him." Thus I can harmonize this passage with the bible view of the destruction of the wicked after the resurrection to my own understanding.

A CORRESPONDENT.

—

Response by Veritas.—"*Macknight*" asks for an explanation of Luke 20: 34–37, with the doctrine of the destruction of a portion of the human family after the resurrection. "Jesus answering, said unto them, the people of this world (*aionos*—this age or this life,) marry and are given in marriage. But among them that shall be honored to share in the resurrection (*tes anastaseos tes ek neckron*, i. e., of the resurrection, *out of dead ones*,) and the other world, there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage, for they cannot die any more; because angel-like, they are children of God, being children of the resurrection. But that the dead are raised, even Moses hath suggested, calling the Lord who appeared in the bush, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now, he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for they are all alive to him." The above, except what is in the parenthesis, is Geo. Campbell's translation given by your correspondent, omitting the words "though dead to us," which are not in the original. Mr. Campbell gives the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark as follows: "But as to the quickening of the dead, have ye not read what God declared to you, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Matt. 22: 32–33. "But as to the dead, that they are quickened, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how God spoke to him in the bush, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Mark 12: 26–27.

Scripture is its own best interpreter. It explains this resurrection *out of*, or from among, dead ones, which implies leaving some dead. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." "But the rest of the dead lived not (i. e., shall not live) again until the thousand years (are) finished." Rev. 20th chap. This divine testimony plainly teaches us that the holy *only* have part in the first resurrection. To these our Lord refers as the "children of the resurrection," i. e., of the *first* resurrection. They are denominated "blessed," for they are to be raised for the purpose of reigning with him "on the earth" (Rev. 5: 10) a thousand years, and they will be like him and with him forever.

To this resurrection the wicked will not attain, nor are they the children of God; they are of their father the devil, and his works they do. But the first resurrection implies a second, and this also is clearly revealed. It is implied in the declaration "the rest of the dead lived not (or will not live) again until the thousand years (are) finished." Soon after the thousand years are finished, the wicked will live again, for John, in revealing the events subsequent to the thousand years, declares, "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened; and another book was opened which was the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hades (the grave) delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to his works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20th chap.

How plain is this solemn testimony to those who are emancipated from the confusion of human traditions, which make void the truth of God.

Here we have the judging of the wicked *after* the first resurrection, and *after* the thousand years reign.

and also their second death in the lake of fire. It is preposterous to understand the words, "I saw the dead," &c., in any other sense than *the raised from the dead;* for, besides the objection to the supposition of men standing before God to be judged while actually dead; if the wicked are not to be raised, where and what is the second death? How can the lake of fire, into which they will be cast, be the *second* death to men who are never raised from the *first?* The second death necessarily implies a resurrection from the first. The *first* resurrection also implies a *second.* Thus we plainly see how the texts can "be harmonized with the destruction of the wicked *after* the resurrection."

It may be well to notice that our Lord's words attach an importance to the doctrine of the resurrection which many Christians overlook. His words plainly teach that death has dominion over *the entire man,* and not merely over an inferior part of him. What is the Saviour's argument to prove that the dead will rise? It is, that if they do not, God would be the God of the dead, which he is not. Now, there is no truth or force in this argument, if Abraham, Isaac or Jacob are now living in glory, for in this case, God would certainly be the God of the living, though there should be no resurrection of the dead.

VERITAS.

YET ANOTHER RESPONSE.—After the foregoing responses were in the hands of our compositor, we received the following from a female correspondent, which, as it unlike those going before, we have concluded to insert:

Bro. Storrs:—I received the February number of the Bible Examiner, and on noticing the question proposed by your unknown correspondent, with your remarks, I felt anxious to tell my mind upon it. I once thought, in view of Jesus' words, John 5: 29, that the good and bad would live again; the latter for no other purpose but to die again. But a better acquaintance with the character of God, his foreknowledge, fixedness, and unchangeableness of purpose, together with the way the wicked of the past are uniformly spoken of, viz: as being destroyed, as well as of the testimony of the Evangelists, that the children of the resurrection are children of God, led me back to the time when the *Lamb* was slain, and from that point to take a view of the works and ways of God. In so doing, I found it much easier to reconcile Jesus' saying with everything else, than everything else with his saying quoted alone, allowing he meant as is generally understood. This was the only rational ground that seemed left to me; for Universalism I cannot believe, but I must, if the wicked are quickened by the Spirit of God, and there is no other way for any one to be, as I can see. To say the least, this alone looks God-like to me.

The question proposed by your correspondent on Luke 20: 34–37, has doubtless puzzled many reflecting minds. Respondent claims a place among these, and now ventures to present the result of reflections on this subject to the public, in the form of a solution to the problem involved, if Br. Storrs deems it fitting and relevant.

The first thing, to my mind, that seems necessary in order to harmonize the resurrection of the wicked and their second death, with the declaration of Luke, together with Mark and Matthew, that those that are raised are as the angels, and can die no more, is to find the nature of the resurrection of the wicked, called by Jesus the "resurrection of damnation;" and also what the "second death" means; a phrase which we see does not occur till we get to that mysterious book, Revelation, although the wicked are frequently spoken of throughout the Bible as being destroyed. In order to get an understanding of these, I invite the reader to go back with me to the time when eternal life was promised, which was before the world began, Titus 1: 2, and take a seat in the council chamber of those convened, when the creation of man was the subject of deliberation. The result of the deliberations of Infinite Wisdom we see at first appearing in the shape of helpless, dependant, knowingless, breathing frames, which, after a lapse of years, are capable of becoming independent, God-like creatures, the crowning work of creation. At first, without much training, there is little except form to distinguish them from the rest of God's creatures; and like them, they are flesh and blood, and must die. Yet such beings are promised eternal life. The great obstacle that first presents itself is death, which effectually excludes all from such a hope, unless removed. The Son of God offers himself a "ransom for all," and thus death is at once virtually abolished, and all the unavoidable consequences of our helpless state and dying nature are at once overcome, till manhood begins to reign, or reason bears sway. In the sense that death is abolished, we are all alive, and a virtual resurrection all may alike claim. It remains, now, for each one to say whether in his case death shall be actual or not; and the same in regard to the resurrection. Arrived at the period when the laws of God are binding, this, then, becomes *the* question for each one to decide for him or herself. If, then, instead of yielding a willing obedience to its claims, we prefer our own ways, we must feel the truth of Jesus' words, "he that believeth not, is condemned already." Thus is the judgment of God eternal, ever against or in favor of each one, as the case may be, as fast as they come to the age of accountability, and choose their course. Let us sound the glad note, "*death is abolished,*" and all are placed on an equal footing; and a chance to "lay hold on eternal life" is open to all. Do we seize this chance by forsaking the evil, and choosing the good? Then are we "passed from death unto life."

Or, do we prefer the pleasures of sin for a season? Then are we dead, virtually so, the *second time;* for the natural, or first death, we all know, is for no fault or choice of ours; so "death unto death" is the irrevocable doom of those who intelligently make this choice, as well as those who "sin without law," both being alike corrupting in their influence.

Now, what bearing have these remarks on the question proposed? Let us look over a little. The case as here presented stands thus: Jesus said, those who believe not, were *already condemned.* Condemnation must follow judgment, and all that remains after being condemned, is the execution of the sentence, unless the criminal is pardoned and cleared; and as we have seen all die once, and are made alive again, *virtually*, which must needs be done first, in order to place mankind in a situation to avail themselves of the promise of life; if this chance is forfeited, there is no help for them. No Saviour to abolish death and make them alive again; and they "know the judgment of God, that those who commit such things"—as every one does who does not love God—"are worthy of death;" and when such come to die, "there is no hope in their death;" their title to an actual resurrection is forfeited. Only those who have been "begotten again by the Word of God," and are formed for, can enter into *life.* The Son of Man is empowered to "execute judgment also," as well as to judge; and when the time shall arrive to make known his sentence, or when he "shall judge the quick and the dead," which seems necessary to make public what was before known only to the parties concerned, and their God, he being alone capable of deciding justly as to their fitness or unfitness to live—all that seems necessary in the case is to do what he said he would for those who believed, viz: *"raise them up;"* and leave those who "are laid in the grave like sheep," to their fate, in accordance with Jesus' words, "he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." The wicked need not be made alive to find out their unfitness to live, any more than the righteous to find out their fitness. Their being quickened is sufficient proof of the one, as is also the non-quickening proof against the fitness of the other class. Then is their destruction known and sealed; and thus can the saying of Luke (and I might add Mark and Matthew) be true, that "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, die no more; for they are equal unto the angels," &c. God, "who calleth things that be not as though they were," is the God of all such, whether waking or sleeping, but he is "not a God of the dead."

RESPONDENT.

—

ANOTHER INQUIRY.—*Br. Storrs:*—Paul saith, Eph. 2: 12, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and estranged from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." From Paul's argument here, I draw the following conclusion:—Man, out of Christ, was outside of the covenant, and without *that* hope which is a resurrection from the *dead*, as described by Paul, Eph. 1: 18–20, "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints. And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Now, if any one can inform me how the wicked get a resurrection from the *dead*, when they are out of the covenant, and out of Christ, after they are destroyed with an "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," which takes place "when the Lord is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," (see 2 Thess. 1: 8, 9,) I say, if any one can inform me how the wicked will get a resurrection from an "everlasting destruction," they may be the means of removing some of the *darkness* which "has happened in part" to some of those who are inquiring *what is truth?*

Yours, in hope of the Resurrection through Jesus,

QUERIST.

NOTE.—We give the foregoing, supposing it to be from the same person as the question on Luke 20, in the last Examiner. We leave it to be answered by some of our correspondents, not promising, however, to publish all that may be written in reply, but will select the best, in our judgment.—ED.

—o—

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 30.]

The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.—1 PETER 5: 1–4.

"The elders"—*presbuterous*—"which are among you I exhort"—*parakalo*—beg, entreat, beseech, admonish, call upon—"who am also an elder"—*sumpresbuteros*—a fellow elder. Peter claims no superiority, he simply denominates himself a *fellow* elder: one who was—"a witness"—not only was an eye witness, but it belonged to his office to testify of those things, viz:—"of the sufferings of Christ." The exhibition of those sufferings, and the manner;

or spirit in which they were endured, formed a prominent topic of teaching; and was essential to exhibit the love of God in Christ, and to arm his followers with the like mind: this is a point insisted upon in the previous chapters. But, as Peter was a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and expected to suffer with him, or be a "partaker" (chap. 4: 13,) in his sufferings, so also, he says, "I am a partaker"—a sharer in—"the glory that shall be revealed"—unveiled, displayed, manifested, disclosed—"feed"—superintend, take care of, teach, instruct—"the flock"---the little flock---"of God:" though a *little* flock, it is the flock of God, and must be taken care of *as such*---"which is among you, taking the oversight thereof"---looking diligently after it, carefully supplying its wants---"not by constraint"---compulsion, unwillingly----"but willingly"---voluntarily, spontaneously---"not for filthy lucre"---not for the sake of base gain, or sordidly---"but of a ready mind"---of a prompt, willing mind; a mind in readiness to do or suffer anything to advance the interest of the flock---"neither as being lords"---domineering, tyranizing, ruling imperiously---"over God's heritage," (see Eph. 1: 18,) "but being ensamples"---marks, patterns, models; be worthy of imitation---"to the flock." Thus, and thus only, are elders to discharge their duties in feeding and governing the church of God. "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away;" that is, when Christ shall be revealed, or unveiled from heaven, those who have faithfully served him in his church, in its tribulation state, according to his example and command, shall receive a crown of life and enter into the incorruptible inheritance. The fifth verse shows that Peter uses the term *elder*, in this chapter, in a *relative* sense, rather than that of *office*.

Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time. Casting all your care upon Him, for he careth for you.—5 to 7.

"Likewise, ye younger"—those in more humble stations, more youthful, or of less experience; (see Luke 22: 26,)—"submit yourselves"—arrange yourselves—"unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject"—submit, yield—"one to another, and be clothed"—put on—"humility"—be lowly in mind, modest in mind and deportment:—"for God resisteth"—sets himself in opposition to, sets himself in battle array against—"the proud"—the arrogant, the haughty, the assuming—"and"—but—"giveth grace"—is in favor of—"the humble"—the lowly in mind, the afflicted, the despised, the unassuming. The idea is this: God sets himself in battle array against the haughty, such as tyrannize over the weak and feeble; but he is on the side of the humble, the lowly in mind: he will himself fight their battles; so that, though weak, they are strong and mighty "Humble yourselves, therefore"—if you would not have God against you; and if you would have him on your side, and your defence and protector—"under the mighty"—the strong, powerful—"hand of God, that he may exalt you"—lift you up, raise aloft, elevate to a state of dignity—"in due time"---at the proper season; or, at an appointed time. Those who humble *themselves* God lifts up: those who exalt themselves, he will cast down; all in due time. Let the humble be patient, and not envy the proud, nor attempt to hasten the ways of God; in the proper time they shall reap, if they faint not. In the meantime---"casting"---throwing, giving up ---"all your care"---anxiety, solicitude---"upon"---or unto---"him"---give it all into his mighty hand to direct and order for you---"for he careth for you"---is concerned for you.

Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. Whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world. ---8 and 9.

"Because your adversary"---opponent, opposer---"the devil"---*diabolos*---the slanderer, calumniator, traducer, backbiter; Satan---"as a roaring"---howling---"lion, walketh"---roveth, or roameth---"about seeking whom he may devour"---drink up, swallow, gulp down, swallow greedily, destroy, annihilate---"whom resist"---stand against, oppose---steadfast"---stable, firm, strong---"in the faith"---in the confidence that God careth for you, and will not leave you in his power, while you confide in him, casting all your care upon him---"knowing"--observing, taking notice--"that the same afflictions"---sufferings, evils endured ---"are accomplished"---endured---"in your brethren that are in the world"---*kosmos*---the land: that is, your brethren that are in the land of Canaan, or Palestine, endure the same afflictions, or trials and sufferings, that you do, who are "scattered abroad."

But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, establish, strengthen, settle you. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.—10 and 11.

"But the God of all grace"—favors of all sorts or kinds—"who hath called"—invited—"us unto his eternal glory"—that is, to immortality, incorruptibility, endless life, or, the adoption of children in the incorruptible inheritance—"by Jesus Christ, after that ye have suffered a while"—a little—"make you perfect"—repair, i. e., restore from breach and decay—"establish"—fix firmly—"strengthen, settle you"—render you firm and unwavering. "To him be glory"—praise—"and dominion"—government, or, mighty deeds—"for ever and ever"—for the ages and ages—"amen"—so let it be.

MAN AND SOUL.—We presume to think that a few extracts from a very old and very scarce English work, on the state of the dead, will not be unacceptable to the reader. The author of it is unknown; the "Epistle Dedicatory" is signed "Estibius Psycalethes." Its title is "*Second thoughts concerning human soul, demonstrating the notion of Human Soul, as believed to be a spiritual and immaterial substance united to the human body, to be an invention of the heathens, and not consonant to the principles of Philosophy, Reason, or Religion.* The Second Edition corrected and enlarged. London, 1704. The treatise is dedicated "To the Most Reverend, Right Reverend, and Rev. the Clergy of the Church of England."

1st Extract.—"I find it (the notion of an immaterial, immortal, substantial being in man or soul,) to be only an opinion derived down to posterity, as it were, upon trust, especially in the Romish Church, who makes such secular advantages of it as I elsewhere show you. Indeed, I have read that there are some writers, referring themselves to an ancient Chronicle of England, do say, that King Druis established a sect of Philosophers, called Druids, or priests of Druis, who, the better to encourage his subjects without dread of death to fight his battles, taught them that they had immortal souls, not subject to death, which should survive them, and be conducted into some place of very great pleasure and happiness if they died in battle." P. 73.

2d Ext.—"If man be a piece of mechanism, it is no more than the scriptures say of him in other cases comparatively, (Rom. 9: 20, Jer. 18: 6;) but I must remind my adversary that man is such a curious piece of mechanism as shows only an Almighty power could be the first and sole artificer; viz: to make a reasoning engine out of dead matter, a lump of insensible earth to live, to be able to discern, to pry and search into the very nature and secrets of heaven and earth: nay of an infinite and omnipotent Being, with abundance more of noble operations. I say, if this be that being which is called mere mechanism, I see no objection but in the words, and, I am sure, no derogation to the honor of an Almighty Croator, or the excellency of man, his perfect and chicfest workmanship." P. 106.

3d Ext.—"Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that God should raise the dead?" St. Paul urges (Acts 26: 8) with a great deal of ardor and zeal to Festus, and we do not find that either he or any one else retorted *because impossible*, no man even daring to say that of Omnipotence. Now, if I put the question in a thing of far less moment than that of the resurrection, I mean the mortality of whole man, why should it be thought impossible that God should make man of a mortal soul body? Why is it impossible for a man to propagate his species totally? Why could not matter be made capable of will and understanding? Sure I am, no man can be so bold as to return answer, because it was impossible for God to do so. For that power which could make this whole sublunary world out of nothing, is certainly able to make matter, ratiocinate, think, and discourse, &c." P. 133.

4th Ext.—"If rationality to man be a demonstration of an immaterial and, consequently, immortal substance in man, it would also be a demonstration *in suo genere*, of the same implanted in brutes, because brutes, according to their degrees of perfection, act rationally: according to the explanation or definition of reasoning, that it is an operation of the mind or understanding, by which every animal is excited to obtain, by diverse ways, the end he proposes to himself, according to the best of his judgment." P. 137.

5th Ext.—"Now, as the words *immortal soul* are never found in all the whole scriptures, and the words salvation of souls but once, so I make a third observation, that, where our Saviour or the apostles raised any person from the dead, they never invocated or commanded the soul to return back into the body of the deceased, but always used such expressions as signified thou *dead person live again*, or tantamount, as damsel arise, Mark 5: 41, young man arise, Luke 7: 14; maid arise, and her spirit (life or breath) came again. So in the discourse between our Saviour and Martha, John 11: 17, relating to the raising up of her brother Lazarus, who had been dead four days, when our Saviour says, thy brother shall rise again, v. 23, Martha replies, v. 24, I know that *he* shall rise again at the last day. But our Saviour replies, v. 26, "I am the resurrection and the life, and he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." In which case, methinks, the dialogue was so particular relating to Lazarus' life, or *living again*, that had our Saviour thought she had meant that he had a spiritual substance separated from him, called his soul, (which separation was the immediate cause of his death,) sure he would have instructed her that Lazarus had such a soul, that was living somewhere, which he could and would recall into the body of her brother Lazarus again. For certainly this would have been a very necessary doctrine to all the world, and a just reproof to her of her error, if such, when she believed that whole Lazarus, viz: body and soul, would lie in the grave until this grand resurrection." Pp. 163, 164.

6th Ext.—"In several places of the scriptures, dying or death is called simply a *not being;* thus, Joseph is not, Simeon is not, and will ye take Benjamin away. Gen. 42: 36, Job 7: 24, Ps. 39: 13, Mat. 2: 18. All which places must imply by not being a total dissolution, for otherwise the expression would be very improper. For if that which gives the being, viz: the spiritual substance or soul, as it is usually called, should *be, exist,* and *remain immortal* after a

man dies, I cannot see how *man* can be said not to be, seeing such an attribute or property can never be applied to an immortal being." P. 207.—*Moncrieff's "Appendix" to Grew's Intermediate State.*

FROM CATHARINE COLVER.

Alford, Mass., Jan. 1, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—The sermons you sent me are all *out* on a mission. Whether there will ever be any fruit God only knows; but we must not be weary in well doing. The walls of superstition and tradition are like the walls of Jericho—they want the trumpeters to march seven days, and at the seventh, give a full blast. That the walls may fall to rise no more, is the sincere wish of my heart. It is fifty years since I joined the Baptist Church, and some of them tell me I am crazy! Well, be it so. I want the truth, and nothing but the truth.

Yours with respect.

THE CHRISTIAN TRUTH-SEEKER.—Br. *N. Bond*, Cleveland, O., says:—I am sorry indeed the Truth-Seeker cannot be published. What it contains, so far as I have seen, (the four first numbers,) is very interesting and instructive to me. Had I the means I should not wait to be asked, but would without delay furnish the needful to send it to the scattered remnant. I have to labor with my hands for my daily bread, and a family of six. If you should again try to publish it, I will double my subscription, and I think the paper well worth a dollar.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We are sorry, too, that we cannot go on with the Truth-Seeker, but hitherto it has been impossible for want of funds.

FROM JONATHAN WILSON.

Warwick, R. I., Jan. 1852.

Br. Storrs:—You may say in your paper that I am still persevering in preaching every Sabbath, if not prevented by the storms on the coasts of R. I. and Mass., whitening my head with the snows of my 75th winter; waiting, wishing and longing for the Lord to come and set up a better government than Kossuth's republican government will be when produced by the corrupt governments of the world.

FROM H. H. HALL.

Peru, Ind., 1851.

The glorious doctrine of "*Eternal Life through Jesus Christ alone,*" is gaining ground in our county very fast. All that is wanted is for the subject to be presented in its proper light, and the publications I am circulating seem to be doing the work, though there is very much needed oral lectures, as there are many who would listen to a speaker who will not read on the subject. May the Lord speed the good work and clear away the darkness that has so long brooded over the religious world. O! how clear the light shines into my mind—how lovely it makes the character of God appear.

LETTERS, &c.—We had prepared extracts from many letters of our correspondents for this number of the Examiner, but we are obliged to leave them out for want of room.

Also, several articles from correspondents we are compelled to lay over till another time. An extract from "*The Bible against Fiction,*" by Aaron Ellis, will appear next month.

LUKE XX. 34–37.—We have thought that for the help of all parties to the understanding of that portion of Scripture, we would give Prof. Murdock's translation of it from "*The Peshito Syriac Version of the New Teslament.*" This version, Prof. Murdock says, "is called by the Syrians the *Peshito* version, on account of its style or character." He adds, "the word, as applied to a translation, signifies *explicit, free from ambiguities, simple, and easy to be understood.* And precisely such is, in fact, the character of this venerable version." P. 489.

In this version Luke 20: 34–37 reads thus: "Jesus said to them, The children of this world take wives, and wives are given to husbands. But they who are worthy of that world, and of the resurrection from the dead, do not take wives, nor are wives given to husbands. Neither can they die any more; for they are as the angels, and are the children of God, because they are the children of the resurrection. But that the dead will rise, even Moses showed: for, at the bush, he maketh mention, while he saith, The Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." The 38th verse reads, "Now God is not [the God] of the dead, but of the living; for they all live to him."

A SIGN OF THE TIMES.—We give the following extracts from an article in the Watchman and Reflector, a Baptist paper, to show the fact that Christians cannot much longer be held under the Moloch doctrine of endless torture. The writer is deprecating the lack of faith in the church in the popular doctrine, and says:—

"The present is a time when the doctrine so long and universally held by the church, of the eternal punishment of the wicked, is but half believed by many, and openly rejected by some among Evangelical Christians. The views of John Foster, [a Baptist Minister in England,] are affecting many minds, notwithstanding all that has been said and written to refute them. Many are at least hoping that his views may prove to be true."

What John Foster's views were will be seen by his letter in the Examiner Dec. 1851, to a young minister, in answer to inquiries and difficulties on the subject of the eternity of future punishment.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1852. NO. 4.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

"BIBLE vs. TRADITION."

A manuscript has been put into our hands, written by Brother Aaron Ellis, of New Richmond, Pa., entitled "*The Bible against Tradition.*" In this work several thousand texts are presented to the reader, more than two thousand of which are pointedly opposed to the doctrines of the immortality of the soul; the separate conscious existence of either the soul or spirit of man, in what is called the intermediate state; and the endless misery of the wicked; and likewise showing that the Hebrew and Greek scriptures do not teach that *hell*, as defined by theologians, is now in existence.

Brother Ellis has, with untiring assiduity, traced all the words that have any relation to the great question of immortality and its kindred doctrines, through the original scriptures, and the common version; and he has most clearly demonstrated that these doctrines are not to be found in the scriptures, and are derived only from the vain traditions of men; and all that is necessary to scatter these fables to the winds is a correct and *literal* translation from the original. If our author, feeling indignant at the imposition so long palmed upon himself and the world, has expressed himself a little roughly here and there, we should remember that the Reformation under Luther, and other important reforms, conflicting with the interests and prejudices of mankind, were not accomplished by a few soft efforts; but by a rough bluntness, indicative of a determination to propagate what is believed to be truth, at all costs, and all hazards. Our author, after exposing the insufficiency and absurdity of the current philosophy touching the nature of the soul, feels himself shut up to the plain teaching of God's word. But we shall permit our readers to hear him for themselves by giving extracts from the revision of his manuscript, which we hope will be read and pondered.

THOMAS READ, *New York.*

THE BIBLE AGAINST TRADITION.

In which the true teaching of the Bible is manifested—The corruptions of Theologians are detected—and the Traditions of Men are exposed. By AARON ELLIS. *Revised.*

I have read the whole of the translation, and the margin of the Old Testament seven times, and the New Testament six times; and have carefully examined every text on the soul, the state of the dead, and the end of the wicked. From this examination I am thoroughly convinced that the whole man becomes unconscious in death. "In that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 4. "Neither have they any more a reward" until the resurrection, (Eccl. 9: 5–6; Luke 14: 14,) when they suddenly awake to give an account of themselves to God in judgment; and then, "All the wicked will God destroy;" yea, He will exterminate both soul and body in Gehenna. There is not a single text in the Old Testament that will not readily harmonize with these views, though there are a few texts in the New Testament from which inferences have been too hastily drawn, that would seem, to a superficial observer, to oppose these views. But where is the doctrine that an incorrect inference from some obscure text does not appear to contradict? But patience and diligence in searching the scriptures, and a comparison of scripture with scripture, allowing the Bible to be its own dictionary, and its own interpreter, (for vain is the help of the learned in this matter,) and by carefully observing the context and the design of the writer, asking wisdom of him "who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not," we may discover the truth, and if we are willing to receive the truth in the love of it, and are obedient thereunto, we have the promise that we "shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

The original Scriptures are the only correct standard. I have found much error in our common translation; the margin, which generally contains the better reading, contradicting the text. Adam Clark says, page 17 of his commentary, that "The marginal readings are essential to the integrity of the text;" "and they are of so much importance as to be in several instances preferable to the *textual readings* themselves," and they "are to be preferred to those in the text in the proportion of at least *eight* to *ten.*" It is but too obvious that sectarian prejudice has too long prevented the eradication of many manifest errors, and that a correct translation, while it would completely harmonize with itself, would effectually undermine every creed in christendom.

It is plain from history, that our first transcribers and translators were Romish priests, who were interested in sustaining the profitable corruptions of the separate existence of the soul in purgatory, and the endless misery of the wicked. Every English translation made prior to the 18th century, has but too clearly copied from the Vulgate, and the translators were not able, as Macknight has fully proved, to translate the whole bible from the original tongues, and the various editions only profess to be *compared with* the original. King James, who died a Papist, gave strict orders to the translators of our common version, not to deviate widely from the *Bishop's bible.* The following directions of the King are copied from page 16 of the preface to Clark's Commentary:

1. "The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishop's Bible, to be followed, and *as little altered as the original will permit.*

4. "When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the *most eminent fathers*, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, *and the analogy of faith.*

14. "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishop's bible, viz: *Tyndal's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch, Geneva.*"

Dr. Macknight says that "Tyndal and Coverdale's translation, of which the rest are copies, was not made from the originals, but *from the Vulgate Latin.*" It is evident that our authorized version was not a new translation from the Hebrew and Greek; but only a revision of certain editions of the Papal Vulgate.

To the common version, it is objected, 1. That it often differs from the Hebrew to follow the Septuagint, and the German translation of the Septuagint. 2. That the translations following the Latin Vulgate, have adopted many of the original words, without translating them, such as *hallelujah, hosanna, mammon, anathema,* &c. 3. That by keeping too close to the Hebrew and Greek idioms, they have rendered the version obscure. 4. That they were a little too complaisant to the king, in favoring his notions of predestination, election, witchcraft, familiar spirits, &c. These, it is probable, were likewise their own opinions. 5. That their translation is partial, speaking the language of, and giving authority to, one sect, (meaning, probably, the Episcopalians.) 6. That where the original words and phrases admitted of different translations, the worse translations, by plurality of voices, were put into the text, and the better were often thrown out or put into the margin. 7. That notwithstanding all the pains taken in correcting this and the former editions of the English bible, there still remain many passages mistranslated either through negligence or want of knowledge; and to other passages, improper additions were made, which pervert the sense. *See Preface to Macknight's translation of the Epistles, pages* 21 *to* 25.

The high encomiums passed on the authorized version may be due to the simplicity, elegance, pathos, and earnestness of its style; but certainly they do not belong to it for its fidelity to the original. On the immortality of the soul, the common version is not so faithful to the original as is the translation from the Latin Vulgate, sanctioned by Bishop Hughes. Drs. Clark and Scott, who speak most highly of our translation, convict it of more errors than any other Commentators. Be it always remembered that all the transcribers and translators, previous to King James, with perhaps the only exceptions of Tyndal and Luther, were believers in the Popish doctrine of the immortality and separate conscious existence of the human soul. There is only one manuscript, marked B., the *Cod. Vaticanus*, No. 1209, in the library of the Vatican at Rome, that dates back as early as the 4th, though probably transcribed in the 5th century. Consequently, all the ancient manuscripts were transcribed 200 years after the kindred doctrines of the immortality of the soul, invocation of dead saints, and purgatory, had become established in the Romish church, and the manuscripts, being scarce, were completely under the control of the Popish clergy. The various readings of manuscripts, and differing opinions of commentators, prove them to have been fallible, and their creeds and traditions would naturally bias them in their interpretations of the original text. If, therefore, we wish to obtain the truth, we are of necessity driven to the Hebrew and Greek originals as the purest accessible fountains. Assisted by an honest and learned friend of the Independent Congregational Society, we have traced all the original terms translated *soul, spirit, life, breath, hell, grave,* and others, throughout the whole bible, so that any person may readily perceive their bible definitions.

Meaning of the original terms rendered soul and spirit.—The Hebrew word, *nephish*, of the Old Testament, occurs about seven hundred times, and is rendered *soul* four hundred and seventy-one times; *life* and *living* about one hundred and fifty times; and the *same* word is also rendered a *man*, a *person, self, they, him, me, any one, breath, heart, mind, appetite*, the *body*, (dead or alive,) *lust, creature*, and even a *beast;* and is twenty-eight times applied to *beasts*, and to *every creeping thing.*

The Greek word *psuche*, of the New Testament, corresponds with the word *nephish* of the Old. It occurs one hundred and five times, and is rendered *soul* fifty-nine times, and *life* forty times. The same word is also rendered *mind, us, you, heart, heartily*, and is twice applied to the beasts that perish. *Psuchikos*, an adjective derived from *psuche*, occurs six times, and is translated *natural* and *sensual;* it is properly translated *animal* in modern translations. 1 Cor. 15: 44, will bear this translation. It is sown *soma psuchikon*, a *soul*-body, or an *animal* body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is *soma psuchikon*, a *soul*-body, or *animal* body, and there is a spiritual body. 45v. And so it is written, (Gen. 2: 7.) The first man, Adam, was made into *psuchen zosan*, a *living soul*, the last Adam into a life-giving spirit. 46v. Howbeit the spiritual *was not the first thing*, but the *psuchikon, animal*, or *soul*-man, and *afterwards* the spiritual man. Thus we see that the adjective *psuchikon* always indicates mortality and corruption, and designates the animal nature, or soul nature of man, in contradistinction to the spiritual nature, or incorruptible nature, which the Christian will receive at the period of his resurrection from the dead.

The word *ruah*, in Hebrew, corresponds with *pneuma* in the Greek. These words are mostly rendered *spirit;* but are likewise rendered *wind, air, breath, life, mind, disposition*, &c., and are sometimes applied to the *beasts*. But it cannot be proved that either of the terms means a ghost, or abstract conscious spirit, in either man or beast.

If any theologian, fearing that the craft is in danger, by which he obtains his wealth, should venture to deny the truth manifested in these pages, he must likewise deny the truth of the bible. And to defeat this work by arguments drawn from the bible, he would be required to produce as many pointed texts opposed to our views, as we have produced; and likewise to show that the thousands of texts here produced are to be interpreted as contrary to their plain and obvious import, as the *dead body* of man is contrary to the *immortal soul* or *ghost* of a man; for the words *meth nephish, dead soul*, occurs eleven times and are four times translated *dead body*, although twice the word soul is put into the margin, (Numb. 19: 11; 6: 6,) but in the other places no intimation is given that the original words *meth nephish, dead souls*, is improperly rendered. We give a few examples, Numb. 19: 16. And whosoever toucheth one that is slain with the sword in the open field, or a *meth nephish, dead soul*, or a *bone* of a *nephish, soul*, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. 2 Chron. 20: 24. Behold, they were *meth nephish, dead souls*, fallen to the earth. 25v. They found among them in abundance both riches, with the *meth nephish*, dead souls, and precious jewels. Ps. 79: 2. The *meth nephish*, dead souls, of thy servants have they given to be *meat* unto the fowls of the heavens. See

also Ps. 110: 6; Lev. 21: 11; Num. 6: 6; 9: 10; 19: 16; Hag. 2: 13.

Thus, then, the fabled immortal souls have bones, and are slain with the sword. These plain texts must not be set aside by incorrect inferences drawn from a few texts which have been forced into the service of our opponents. Let us have scripture argument, for we shall treat human wisdom and invention as unworthy of notice. Although, in this discussion, we shall now and then be compelled to use plain and severe language to dishonest priests, who will neither acknowledge the truth, nor permit others to judge for themselves, yet we do not design to treat unkindly the honest and the liberal; and especially do we desire to avoid anything that has the slightest tendency to deter the sincere inquirers after truth.

In the forth-coming pages we shall unfold the truths of the bible relating to the nature and destiny of man, expose the pious frauds and forgeries of theologians, and manifest their numerous and glaring absurdities. And, *First*, we shall prove from the Bible the corporeal being and mortality of the soul, and the nature of the spirit of man; which spirit, not being a living entity, is neither mortal nor immortal. And, *Second*, we shall prove that the *hell* of the Bible imports the utter extermination of the wicked cast therein, the deprivation of their life and being.

ELDER JOHN TATE'S DEFENCE.

[Continued from Vol. VI. page 183.]

Our readers will see by reference to Vol. VI. page 160, that Br. Tate is charged, before the New England Wesleyan Conference, with preaching "*Unchristian Doctrine.*" The following is the continuation of his defence before that body.—Ed.

Mr. President:—I have endeavored to defend the doctrine that man is not immortal in his own nature, from the most positive declarations of the Old Testament. I have also shown that the principles laid down by several distinguished Immaterialists, lead to the same conclusion. I will now pass on to the New Testament. What did Jesus and his Apostles teach respecting the immortality of man? My answer is, they taught that immortality is a privilege and a blessing to be sought after. It is the gift of God, conditionally bestowed on man through Jesus Christ. In proof of this position, I refer to Rom. 2: 6–7. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life.

I propose to carefully and logically analyse the the passages which I shall adduce in support of my doctrine. I intend to prove that the common notions of man's natural immortality are in direct opposition to the Son of God and his Apostles. To the vain uncertain inferences of modern theologians, I oppose the boldest and most positive declarations of Jesus. To you, brethren, I make my appeal. Judge ye what I say. With reference to the passage quoted I remark—

1. There are three things presented to view as objects to be desired—*glory*, *honor*, *immortality*.

2. These three things are to be sought for, if we would have them.

3. Such, and only such as seek for them, shall receive eternal life.

Dr. Clarke's note on the text is as follows: "In this manner will God in the great day dispense punishments and rewards. He will give eternal life to them who, in all the trials and difficulties of the present state, have persevered in well doing; seeking for and expecting glory, honor and immortality."

Here the Commentator represents immortality not as inherent in or resulting from the nature of man, but as a contingency depending on the conduct of man and the will of God. Such as seek it, and they only, shall receive the precious boon. Nor can the threatening denounced against the wicked in the context invalidate this interpretation. Sinners will suffer tribulation and anguish, but the text does not say they will experience anguish forever. If the sinner shall suffer anguish during any given period of duration, the threatening denounced will be fully accomplished so far as the actual experience of pain is concerned. And the fact that in the text immortality is limited to the righteous, involves the idea of the final termination of the life of the wicked and of course of their anguish also.

Professor Stuart, on the passage before us, says:—"We may translate the phrase thus: Immortal glory and honor; or we may render it glorious and honorable immortality, or honorable and immortal glory." The Professor does not say we *must* so translate the passage, but we *may* do so. This seems to imply that the passage *may* be rendered as in our version. When an alteration is proposed in the translation of a passage which affects an important doctrine like that of immortality, we ought to have something stronger than a mere *may be* or *may do* to warrant this change. Clarke is satisfied with our version, and so with Scott. It is to my mind a clear proof that immortality is not natural to man; on the contrary, we can secure life to eternity only by a patient continuance in well doing.

I will now turn to the testimony of Jesus Christ. And here I may remark that, if language affords any terms by which we can express the ideas of endless conscious being and total destruction of being, these are the very terms which the Saviour applies to the future states of men. Of the righteous, he says they shall have life; they shall never perish, but have everlasting life; they shall be raised to life, neither shall they die any more. John uses similar language. The righteous shall not be hurt of the second death. There shall be no more death. Of the wicked I read, they shall die, perish, be burned, burned up, they will lose life, be destroyed; their end is destruction, and they shall be punished with everlasting destruction. Now, these are solemn and positive declarations, and you will perceive they are applied, not to emotions or mere conditions of mind, but to the very being of the righteous and the wicked. Nothing is more plainly affirmed than the endless life of the one class, and the entire extermination of the other class from conscious being. And when men shall be emancipated from the dominion of human authority—when they will dare to subject their contradictory and sectarian creeds to a severe logical investigation, then will they reject the popular theology of the day as monstrously unreasonable and palpably unscriptural. So strong is this conviction in my mind, that I believe that, within thirty years, the dogma of eternal torment will be ranked with the blasphemous absurdities of unconditional reprobation and infant damnation.

But to the argument. I read, Matt. 10: 39, "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." On this I offer the following remarks:

1. The Saviour had just intimated that a profession of faith in him would subject the believer to desertion and persecution,

2. He that in this world findeth life, is plainly one who, on account of his profession of christianity, was in danger of being martyred for his faith, but when the hour of trial came, loving life more than Christ, he denied his Lord to keep his life.

3. He who loseth life for Christ's sake, is plainly one who, rather than deny or curse his Saviour, suffered martyrdom.

4. Of these two characters, it is said that one shall find his life, the other shall lose his life.

Now, when we read that he who loses his life for Christ's sake shall find it, we all agree this has reference to the immortal life of the future state. Christ's martyrs shall revive and live again, and that forever. Thus far I say we agree. But in reference to the loss of life which apostates will experience, you seem to me flatly to deny the words of the Son of God. If the great Revealer of Truth is to be trusted, then in some sense the apostate will lose life. Will you tell me that in the case of such as find life and subsequently lose it, that Jesus merely meant they would lose their natural life? *Did the Saviour, think you, mean nothing more than that if his disciples abandoned him, and joined with infuriate Jews and Gentiles to curse him, that they would sometime die a natural death?* Such an idea appears to me an absurdity. Jesus did not trifle in this way. There is in the text a double antithesis. In this world, the apostate keepeth his life, but the faithful disciple loseth his life. We are then directed into the future world. There the faithful disciples find their lives, and there apostates lose their lives. Thus, according to Jesus, only some will be immortal in the future. We learn from other passages that the apostate will be revived again to life, but that life will be transient, not perpetual. The apostate's second life will be terminated by the second death, after which he will have no more being in the universe forever.

Matt. 16: 25–26, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul, (*life*, so Clarke,) or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (life.)

1. Here, again, to lose life for the sake of Christ, is to be martyred on account of adherence to him.

2. To save life, is to abandon Christ and so avoid martyrdom.

3 Such as lose life for Christ, shall find it again, and such as keep life by denying him shall finally lose life.

4. Hence, if a man could gain the whole world, it would not be any permanent advantage to him. He will soon lose his personality. His life will be utterly and forever extinguished. The possession of a personal existence is absolutely necessary to the possession of things external. Hence, when life is lost—when the man himself is lost, there can be no further possession of anything. To give away therefore the possibility of everlasting personal existence, with the glorious possessions always connected with immortal life, for a few years of life and comfort on the earth, is the greatest conceivable folly.

John 3: 14–16, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," &c., &c.

Here we find that men are in danger of perishing. But what is it to perish? According to the popular theology of the day, for the human soul to perish, it must live forever. Not only must it live forever, but it must progress onward to higher and still higher degrees of intellectual vigor and power, to all eternity. What a contradiction! The prevailing idea is, that the more the lost soul advances into higher degrees of power and consciousness—in other words, the more it lives, the more it dies! It *withers, it perishes* in its everlasting accumulations of new knowledge and experience! Now I ask, what is the common and also the scriptural idea involved in the verb *to perish?* Walker defines it thus—to die, to be lost. Johnson defines it by the words, to be destroyed, to decay. The definitions in Butterworth's Concordance are, 1. To die. 2. To be rooted out. 3. To starve. 4. To be damned. 5. To be deprived of being. 1 Cor. 15: 18.

I will notice a few passages to ascertain what is the real meaning of "*to perish*," in the New Testament.

Matt. 8: 25, "Lord save us, we perish." The disciples were afraid of being drowned. Had they been drowned, their human life would have been extinguished. They would have perished out of their then present mode of existence.

Matt. 9: 17, "The bottles perish." When the bottles burst, they cease to be bottles. The materials remain, but they exist no longer in the form of bottles. The bottles are utterly destroyed.

John 11: 50, "And that the whole nation perish not." To perish here is explained in verse 48. If we let him alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation. The Romans will utterly destroy our nationality. As a nation we shall cease to exist.

John 6: 27, "Labor not for the meat that perisheth." The food we eat is in its nature corruptible, and the strength it affords is only transient; both will soon cease to exist.

1 Cor. 15: 18, "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." It is indisputable that in this passage, the word *perished* denotes the utter extinction of life without any future restoration. As Butterworth has it, the word here means "*to be deprived of being.*"

2 Pet. 2: 12, "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, ——— shall utterly perish in their own corruption." As the destruction of brute beasts is complete, so will ungodly men utterly perish. All who do not maintain the existence of brute souls separate from their bodies, must see that this passage teaches the entire destruction of the wicked, so that they will be as though they had not been.

In all these passages, the word *perish* plainly denotes the utter destruction of the subjects to which it refers. When used to express the final doom of the wicked, it means the entire extinction of their conscious being. Their names will be blotted out of the Book of Life. The materials which composed their natures will indeed remain, but they will be disorganized and dissolved, and may then be used in the production of new forms of animated beings.

I find, then, in the passages which I have quoted, two different destinies placed in contrast with each other. On the one hand, we have a *conditional* immortal life. On the other hand, we see men losing life—perishing even as natural brute beasts out of the creation of God. How, then, can you require me to believe in the immortality of the soul—in the endless conscious being of the wicked, when Jesus positively declares the contrary? Your doctrine of immortality is not in the New Testament, any more than the ground of immortality is in the nature of man. The ground of our endless life is to be found

only in the will of God and the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

John 5: 24–29, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Here I find the term *life* used with reference to the Father, "*as the Father hath life in himself.*" Every one must see that here the word *life* does not relate to the happiness of God, but to his conscious, necessary and infinite vitality. So with reference to the Son, the term *life* plainly means vital being. Jesus is the *Life*, the everliving Mediator, the divinely appointed medium through which eternal life is given to man. In verse 25, there is a plain reference to Jairus' daughter, the widow's son, and Lazarus. No sane man will pretend that the word *life* here means *happiness*. These persons were restored from the insensibility of death, to an animated conscious existence.

Well, then, in the next place, we have the term *life* used with reference to a great class of men who will come forth in the great resurrection. They shall come forth to *life*. Now, if within the limits of a few lines, we find the Saviour using the word *life* with reference to his Father, himself, and the three persons before named, and meaning in these three applications of the term, an active conscious existence, then I submit whether we are not bound to understand the word *life* in the same sense in verse 29? Those that have done good will come forth to life—to a conscious vital existence. But such a life is the privilege of those only who did good. The term life is placed in contrast with the word damnation, viz: condemnation. To what, then, is the sinner condemned? I answer, "The wages of sin is death." "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die." "He that soweth to his flesh shall reap corruption." Whose end is destruction." "The second death." Surely we could not be told in plainer language that only the righteous will live forever, and that the conscious life of the wicked will be finally and eternally lost.

I pass on to the 6th chapter of John. It is full of the doctrine of a conditional immortal life. I cannot dwell upon it at length, but will notice some of the main points.

1. Jesus is the great supporter of life. *I am the bread of life.* It is by him that the life of his people will be perpetuated to eternity.

In order that we may be the subjects of everlasting life, we must eat the flesh of Jesus and drink his blood, i. e., believe in him. Now I ask, what is the chief object of a man in eating? Is it to be happy or to sustain life? To sustain life, surely. So in the case before us. We must eat the flesh and drink the blood of Jesus as the indispensable condition of living forever.

That life is here to be understood of conscious existence, and not of happiness, is clear from verse 57. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."

1. The words *living Father* denote the unchangeable, infinite vitality of the Deity.

2. "And I live by the Father." As mediator, he was dependant on the Father for the origination and conservation of his life.

3. As Jesus lives by the Father, even so shall all who believe in him live by him to eternity. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever.

One positive declaration like this is worth more than a thousand *mere inferences*, such as are urged by the advocates of natural immortality in support of that great delusion.

John 11: 23–26, "Jesus saith unto her, thy brother shall rise again. * * * Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

1. Here we have a case of real death. The resurrection and the life cannot then be figurative and spiritual, but real and literal.

2. Jesus declares himself to be the resurrection and the life, by which he plainly means that the resurrection of the dead, and their being made immortal, will be effected through his intervention and by his power.

3. Life in the resurrection state is promised and restricted to believers in Christ. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall *he* live.

4. The promise is given and restricted to believers, that they shall never die, or not die forever.

Let us carefully examine this passage.

1. Some take the words *shall never die* as they stand in our version and apply them exclusively to the soul, to prove it immortal. I answer, admitting this application, we have a fact stated and another implied. The fact stated is, that the souls of believers are immortal. The fact implied is, that the souls of unbelievers are *not* immortal. As the words in question are restricted to believers, it follows if they relate exclusively to the soul, that only the souls of believers will live forever.

2. But you will probably agree with me to adopt Clarke's rendering, "*shall not die forever.*" Now, as these words indicate a privilege which the righteous *only* shall possess, it follows that in the sense of the text *the wicked will die forever.* I may here remark that the verb *to die* plainly denotes not so much the act of dying as the subsequent condition in a state of death. Whosoever believeth in me shall not be dead, or remain dead forever. Now the words *shall not die forever* must be understood in one of these ways:

1. They may relate exclusively to the soul. According to this the souls of believers will live forever, but the souls of the wicked will die and remain dead forever.

2. Suppose they relate exclusively to the body. According to this application, the bodies of the saints after a certain time will live forever, but the bodies of the wicked will be dead forever.

3. The words may be applied to the entire compound nature of man. According to this, after a certain time, the bodies and souls of the saints will be the subjects of everlasting life, but the bodies and souls of the wicked will be involved in everlasting death.

Thus a careful analysis of the passage leads me to the conclusion, that immortality is not natural to man. It is the gift of God through our Lord Jesus

Christ. They that sow unto the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting. But as many do not believe in Jesus—do not sow unto the spirit, they will not be entitled to the privilege and the gift of eternal life. Such, according to Jesus, will finally perish out of the universe and be no more forever.

John 14: 19, "Because I live, ye shall live also." I believe in every passage in which Jesus is said to *live*, or to be *alive;* the verb *to live*, or the noun *life*, denotes not the happiness of Christ, but his conscious active existence. Thus in Acts 1: 3, "To whom he showed himself alive after his passion." Rom. 6: 10, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Heb. 7: 25, "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." Rev. 1: 18, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore."

So in the text under consideration. When Jesus said because *I live*, he meant *life*, not *happiness*. The words *I live* include his life among men on earth, and his glorious life in the heavens. In his life our life is involved and secured, if we are his disciples. Hence the notion that the ground of our immortality is in our nature, is directly opposed to the teaching of Jesus. Our Lord now lives, and when the proper time comes, he will fulfill the promise in the text. He will speak with a mighty voice and call forth his saints to *life*—a happy and glorious life it will be of course.

Rev. 2: 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Here seems to be a plain allusion to the tree of life in the terrestial paradise. If Adam had remained obedient, he would have been permitted to eat of that tree, and by so doing, the tendencies of his physical nature to decay would have been counteracted. After he sinned, the reason assigned for his expulsion from paradise was, *lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever*. What was lost in the first Adam is recovered by the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. Jesus was lifted up in order that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. This everlasting life is here figuratively set forth by the Redeemer. To such as overcome the evil that is in the world, he will give the blessed privilege of eating of the tree of life. Now men do not live to eat; on the contrary they eat to live. The primary end of our eating is not to enjoy pleasure, but to maintain life. And so in the case before us. To eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God, figuratively represent the fact that God will maintain and perpetuate the life of his people forever. Here again, immortality is presented to view, not as inherent in man's nature, but as resulting from the divine will and goodness. I am compelled, then, to believe that when Jesus promises life, eternal life, to his people, he means just what he says. The common notion that the word *life* means *happiness*, when it is applied to the future state, is an unfounded assumption and an absurdity. I claim that the spirit of the revelation on this subject is manifest in the letter. And were my brethren to get rid of the unscriptural notion that man is immortal in his own nature, as Brother Lee contends, they would soon see how beautifully the doctrine of conditional immortality harmonizes with the divine character and dispensations. A milder glory would be seen surrounding the throne of the Everlasting Father. Far less perplexity would be experienced in contemplating the doom of the impenitent. In preaching, you could give a more confident utterance to God's positive declarations than of mere doubtful inferences; and your doctrine would recommend itself to thinking men as being reasonable as well as scriptural. God's testimony is true. This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.

There are many other passages in the New Testament which I would like to notice, but I will pass them for the present.

I proceed to inquire by what means will believers be made immortal? I answer, by a resurrection from death. In support of this answer, I urge the following considerations:

1. Because the dead with but few exceptions are unconscious, and will remain so until their embodiment at the resurrection.

1. It seems to me utterly improbable that those persons whom Jesus raised from the dead had been in a conscious state between their death and reanimation. Suppose they all went to heaven when they died. There, according to our modern theology, they were inconceivably happy. Now I ask, is it probable, if such was their condition, that Jesus would call them from the society of immortals and subject them again to the cares and troubles of this world? To me this seems very improbable. In every other case, Christ's miracles elevated men and improved their condition. But in the case af Lazarus and others, instead of elevation and progression, we have degradation. An immortal spirit is transferred from its celestial to a terrestial sphere, and subjected again to the bitter malice of the wicked, and the manifold evils of a mortal state. To say the least, such a retrograde movement of the human spirit, after its supposed glorification in the heavens, is not in hormony with the general method of the divine operations.

2. That the dead are unconscious, I argue from the fact that dead saints are represented as being *asleep*. See 1 Cor. 15: 18. 1 Thess 4: 13–14. I cannot see with what propriety the word *sleep* is confined entirely to the dead body. In the common language of life, the word *sleep* doubtless expresses our idea of a certain state of the body; but it alse denotes a *condition of mind*. For the most part, sleep is a suspension of intellectual action, as well as of the voluntary physical motions. Suppose a man to lay on his bed with eyes closed and limbs motionless—and suppose, farther, that while apparently fast asleep, you knew he was studying out a solution of an intricate problem in mathematics—would you say he is asleep? I think all men regard a healthy, profound sleep as involving a temporary suspension of the mental powers. And this idea of sleep is most appropriate with reference to the passages referred to. On this point I shall quote from Archbishop Whately, who says, "The Apostle Paul, for instance, in comforting the Thessalonians concerning their deceased brethren, does not make any mention of their being *at that time* actually in a state of enjoyment; but alluding only to the joyful resurrection which awaited them. I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, &c. Now this was, to be sure, a very consolatory prospect concerning their departed friends, but if he had known, and had been authorized to reveal, that these very persons were at that very time actually admitted to a state of happiness, one cannot but suppose he would have mentioned this as an additional consolation, and one more immediately striking; instead of which he makes no mention of an intermediate state of happiness, but merely speaks of a *hope* as of something future respecting the de-

parted—the hope of a glorious resurrection to them that sleep." See Bible Ex. for March, 1850.

What Whately here says, appears to me weighty and appropriate. If the Apostle believed the departed saints were *then* happy, why did he not refer to that fact when he was comforting their mourning friends? How do you conduct in similar cases? When you call to see a pious widow, whose husband lived and died a christian, how do you speak to her smitten heart? Why, you tell her the departed spirit is inconceivably happy. Instead of drawing your consoling utterances from the resurrection, ye talk of the *present* bliss and glory of the departed saints. And this is perfectly proper, provided your views of the separate state are correct. For *you* to omit all reference to the intermediate state of the dead in Christ, would be strange and unaccountable. And so with Paul. If Paul held as you do, that departed saints existed in a state of conscious enjoyment, he could not have overlooked a fact of such consequence, and so well adapted to afford comfort to his brethren. The idea that the departed were *then* happy, would have been first presented, while the subsequent fact of the resurrection would have been an ulterior consideration.

When, then, Paul speaks of the dead as being *asleep*, I understand him to mean they are mentally inactive. At death, the soul is deprived of those organs which are necessary to intellectual action. As Mr. Wesley says, "*thinking is not, as many suppose, the act of a pure spirit, but the act of a spirit connected with a body, and playing upon a set of material keys.*" If thinking is not the act of a pure spirit, but the act of the spirit only as it is connected with a body, then it follows that in its state of naked unembodiment, it must remain "alike unknowing and unknown" until the resurrection. Then, furnished with better organs, it will act with greater vigor and harmony than it can do in this imperfect state of being.

3. Paul teaches that the resurrection is *absolutely essential* to future life. In the church at Corinth, there was one man who denied the doctrine of the resurrection. This is evident from what Paul says, 1 Cor. 15: 35, "But some men will say how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" All Paul's reasoning in this chapter, is directed against this denial of the resurrection. He states the negative doctrine of the false teacher hypothetically, and then shows the conclusions which necessarily follows—If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is not Christ risen. And if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. Paul's reasoning amounts to this—if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Jesus Christ now dead, and will remain dead forever. Now, a dead man cannot quicken and raise the dead, and without such a quickening and resurrection, our departed brethren are lost, *fully and forever perished.* Our only hope of future life rests on the promise of Christ to raise up his people at the last day. But if there is to be no resurrection, then our dearest hope vanishes away, and of all men we are the most miserable.

Farther on, the Apostle teaches us in the most direct manner, that without a resurrection there can be no future conscious existence. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not; let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." This passage is so positive and unambiguous, that it has forced from some of the advocates of natural immortality and endless torment an acknowledgment of the doctrine which I maintain. Dr. Clarke's note on the text is as follows—"What the Apostle says here, is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine that there is no resurrection, for, if there be no resurrection, then there can be no judgment, no future state of rewards and punishments. Why, therefore, should we bear crosses and keep ourselves under continual discipline? Let us eat and drink, take all the pleasure we can, for to-morrow we die, and there is an end of us forever."

Here Clarke maintains that if there is to be no resurrection, then death is the full and final end of man, and there can be no future rewards or punishments.

I could refer to many other passages in proof that the popular doctrine of natural immortality was not the doctrine of Jesus and his Apostles. Those already quoted teach us that immortality is not to be expected until the resurrection. Accordingly the great facts of the second appearing of our Lord, and the resurrection, are constantly pressed on us as inducements to cherish and practice every christian virtue. But this is not the style of our modern preaching. We are perpetually referring to the shortness of life, and warning our people that as soon as they die they will immediately go to 'Canaan's fair and happy land,' or "Sink into a burning hell."

Such announcements are far too hasty. It would be better for us and for God's cause to give over manufacturing human thunder, and abandon the very common practice of painting fancy sketches of the state and place of the dead. Men's imagination have had far too much to do with this matter. I have heard some declaim about it, and speak with as much confidence about the minutiæ of the future, as if they had been in every avenue and corner of the invisible world. My wish is, I think, to learn what Jesus taught, and be satisfied with *that.* And as I now understand his doctrine, I see a beauty, a holy harmony, in the ways of God which I could not see before. I now find no difficulty in believing that God is just, and his throne is established in righteousness.

Thus I have given you my reasons for publicly denying the natural immortality of man. That notion has *no* foundation in the scriptures. It is a vain assumption, a fiction, a delusion. Immortality is God's free gift in and through Jesus Christ. He who fails to secure it must perish and be no more. The natural tendency of the soul is to cease to exist; hence with Br. Lee I affirm, that it requires the constant exercise of that almighty power which created it to keep it in being. With Mr. Wesley I maintain, that the soul cannot form one thought independently of the bodily organization. With Dr. Clarke I hold, that if there be no resurrection, then death is the final end of man, and there can be no judgment—no future state of rewards and punishments. With Mr. Watson I agree, that immortality is a *privilege* which God has given to man; and that "the notion that the soul is naturally immortal, is contradicted by the scriptures, which make our immortality a gift dependant on the will of the Giver." We receive our title to immortality in our regeneration, and it will be actually bestowed in the resurrection. All whose names are written in the book of life will receive the gracious *privilege* to live forever. And those whose names are not so recorded, will be cast into the lake of fire, where they will reap the final consequence of their sins, which is the second death.

NOTE.—In copying the foregoing article, I have abridged some parts of it; and here and there I have

added a few remarks which were not in the original. But the argument is essentially the same as the one urged in my defence before the Conference. Bro. Lee scarcely noticed a single point in the above argument. If he, or any other of my former companions in the ministry, should reply to it, now that it is published, I would be thankful to have forwarded to me a copy of the publication which may contain the reply. My address is "JOHN TATE, Grandville, Kent Co., Mich."

THE SPIRIT MAY LIVE.

BY J. B. FRISBIE.

"If he (God) set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."—Job 34: 14–15.

I have been studying whether the truth does not lie between two extremes, as Br. Storrs once wrote to me. That is, we argue if man has an immortal soul that enters immediately after death into rewards of happiness or misery, without the body, it destroys the scripture view of the resurrection. For if all receive their doom at death, it would be extreme folly to believe that they shall be brought back again from hell and heaven and put on their bodies and be judged back to the very places where they have already been. Such a view overthrows the resurrection of the dead and the atonement.

On the other hand, it is argued, as an objection, that if the whole man dies, soul, body and spirit, and all go back to their native elements; that the being, man, is then as if he never had been—so to resurrect would be to create anew just such a being, which cannot be the same being, even if every particle and element should be precisely restored as before, it would not be a resurrection. But a new creation of another being like the first would not be the first. And it would be very doubtful whether such a being could ever remember his former existence. And that a resurrection would be impossible under such circumstances.

Thus I have stated the two objections, that they may appear in contrast, which to many seem equally plausible, while some, for the daring absurdity of the first, have renounced it and come over to the latter view, when others have been kept from embracing the latter view, because of the seeming inconsistency in the above respect.

It can do no harm, as I can now see, if I should mark out a *middle* course that may possibly meet both classes of objectors. If so, it may result in much good, and redound to the glory of God in bringing others to a knowledge of the truth.

It cannot be disputed that many have and do become unconscious in life by different causes, such as fracture or pressure of the brain, by swoon, fits, fainting, sleep, &c., of which we have abundant proofs by every day's observation, by medical authors and moral philosophy, in which are accounts of those who have become unconscious for days, weeks, months, &c., who, when they have been awaked into consciousness, do immediately call to mind the last thing that transpired before going into this state, but not the faintest recollection, knowledge or consciousness of what had passed during the intermediate time. This proves conclusively that *life* does exist of the man, his spirit, or whatever it may be, and still not be conscious. If so in life, why not after death the spirit live and still be unconscious? It is so when it is wholly dependant on bodily organs for thoughts, knowledge, sight, hearing, feeling, consciousness, &c. May not this be consistent? And at the same time meet the objections on both sides of this great question? This will show the necessity of the same bodily organs upon which the spirit may again be permitted to act, and by so doing it may act out its own former being. For it is certain that identity of body is not dependant on the same particles of matter, but especially upon organization. For it is an admitted fact that bodies change off every particle of matter every seven years, and yet we retain our identity from childhood to old age. Therefore, we can see at once that a resurrection does not depend on the same particles of matter. But let our reasoning be what it may upon this subject, it can amount to little without revelation. Then "to the law and to the testimony."

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of" *lives*, (margin.) This favors the idea of Adam's having a double life breathed into him, one of the body, the other of the spirit. With this agrees the text at the head of this article, "If God gather unto himself his *spirit* and his *breath*." In this text there appears to be two, *spirit* and *breath*, and the one is not the other, that is gathered at death. The same idea is brought to view by Isaiah 42: 5, "God giveth *breath* unto the people—and *spirit* to them," &c. Here breath and spirit are so used that they do not appear to be the same. Once more the spirit is spoken of as a formation. Zech. 12: 1, "The Lord *formeth* the spirit of man within him." Job says, 32: 8, "But there is a *spirit in man*, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the *spirit* of man which is in him." 1 Cor. 2: 11–12. Spirit—beareth witness with our spirit, &c. Rom. 8: 16. This shows that *understanding* and *knowledge* are ascribed to the spirit in man. Now, it appears that this spirit God gathers to himself at death, as Job 34: 14, and Eccl. 3: 21, "Who knoweth the *spirit* of man that goeth upward?" Eccl. 12: 7. "The *spirit* shall return unto God who gave it." Luke 8: 55, "Jesus said, Maid, arise, and her *spirit* came again, and she arose straightway." Acts 7: 59, "Stephen called upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my *spirit*." The grain of wheat seems to favor the same idea, (1 Cor. 15: 36,) that there is a life or germ that survives the death of the old grain. Upon this evidence I will suppose that the spirit of man lives after the body is dead. Yet, understand, I do not argue that the spirit is either conscious or immortal separate from the body. Not conscious, because when connected with bodily organs, if these organs are fractured, there is no consciousness. Not immortal, from the fact that Isaiah 57: 16, says of God, he "will not contend forever, and be always wroth, for the *spirit* should *fail* before me and the souls which I have made." God might be eternally wroth, if the *spirit* or *soul* were immortal—it could never fail; that is, decay, perish, or die. God is said to be "the Father of the spirits of all flesh." Num. 16: 22; 27: 16; Heb. 12: 9. But to believe that there is a living principle something above animal life that is separated from the body at death, appears to be favored by the scriptures already quoted, and such as Matt. 10: 28, "Fear not them that kill the body," (the animal life,) but are not able to kill the soul, (the superior life, that survives the death of the body,) which God is able and will destroy or kill in hell with the body after the resurrection, unless he is feared and obeyed. This shows the soul is *not* immortal, because it can be destroyed or killed.

Again, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God," to be received when Christ comes. Col. 3: 4. Here is life that is called the Christian's life, that will exist when the body is dead. Yet this does not argue its immortality or even its conscious existence; and it could never become conscious if never placed in connection with bodily organs in the resurrection. Both soul and body of the righteous are to be made immortal in the resurrection, but the wicked shall not be. These spirits will God bring with him. He died for us, whether we wake or sleep, we should *live* together with him. 1 Thess. 4: 14, and 5: 10. Yours in hope of immortality by a resurrection.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1852.

NEW WORKS.—Several months since we sent to England for two works on Immortality, to which our attention was called by a friend. They have just been received. The first is entitled—

"*Life and Death*, or, the Theology of the Bible in relation to Human Immortality. Three Lectures, by J. PANTON HAM, Minister, formerly of Lodge Street Chapel, now of Cooper's Hall Congregational Church, Bristol," England.

The other work is by the same author, and entitled—

"*The Generations Gathered and Gathering;* or, the Scripture Doctrine concerning Man in Death."

This last work is wholly occupied with the subject its title imports; and, in our judgment, is the very best thing that has appeared for the *present state* of the controversy. It contains about one hundred and sixty pages 12mo. We are determined it shall be republished immediately in some form. For lack of means to do it otherwise, we think to issue it in a double number of the Bible Examiner. It will, we judge, fill two Examiners solid. If published in this manner, we shall have it stitched with covers and sent to all our subscribers. Others who wish to obtain the work, can have it sent by mail, *free of postage*, by remitting us twenty cents, *post-paid*. Any person who will remit us $5 immediately, shall have fifty copies; but they will be sent at their expense. For one dollar we will send six copies by mail, free of postage. But orders must be sent immediately to insure being supplied. If, however, orders are sent which we cannot supply, we will return the money at our own expense. Do not lay down this paper till you have made up your mind to send for the work; and do so without delay, or you may not get it at all. It cannot be published without cash, and few more than to supply our regular subscribers will be printed, unless ordered immediately. This work cost us 62½ cents, and is well worth double the money.

Whether we shall republish the other work on "*Life and Death*," we will speak more fully shortly. That contains more matter, and we have not had time to examine it fully.

—o—

CORRESPONDENTS, ETC.—Owing to a press of other matters, and absence from the city, we have not bee able to attend to articles sent us on Chronology, and various other inquiries. We will try not to forget them. The three articles on Chronology we republished because the Examiner for 1847, containing them was out of print. We originally published *eight* articles on the subject. The *five* remaining ones can be found in the Examiner for 1848, and will not be republished unless called for. We can still supply a few volumes of '48 & '49 bound in one. Price $1.50. Postage on it, 32 cents under 500 miles, and double that over 500 and under 1500.

—o—

"THE SPIRIT MAY LIVE."—We offer the following remarks on Br. Frisbie's suggestions on the foregoing page, about a "middle view of the state of the dead." Whatever Br. F. may do, we never expect to satisfy those who, like the Sadducees, think a resurrection impossible because they cannot comprehend "*how* the dead" are "raised up." As to the *state* the spirit of man is in while man is dead, it is in vain to speculate; and we can know nothing about it further than God has been pleased to make known. That it is unconscious, Br. Frisbie maintains; that it may be *alive* he thinks possible. Suppose that is admitted, does it ease the minds of the second class he speaks of, or our opponents? We think not. They are satisfied with no such view, so far as we know. The offence with them is, that we maintain the dead are unconscious—that there is "*no knowledge* in sheol"—the state of the dead. This is what strikes the death blow to their natural immortal-soul theory.

But it strikes us that Br. Frisbie's suggestion that because consciousness may cease in this present state and yet the spirit be alive, therefore the spirit may be alive, though unconscious, after the man is dead, is not well founded. A *fact* is undeniable. While the man is alive the signs of life are evident; but when the man is dead, there is no sign of life, and therefore no evidence of the spirit being exempt from death; to pass beyond that point, looking for life still existing, is to launch into an unknown land. The *identity* of the man is maintained by the power of his Creator, we have never doubted, and have always contended. But that *life* is essential to maintain that identity is what lacks proof. And to assume, as the second class do, that Br. F. speaks of, that if the life of *the entire man* is suspended, God cannot restore *the same* man to life, is a palpable denial of the resurrection of *the dead;* it is an error that originates in "ignorance of the scriptures and the power of God." Br. F. has said that the identity of

the body depends not upon the same particles of matter of which the body was composed, but "upon *organization.*" The same identical organization must of necessity, when made alive, develope the same identical mind, and we have no occasion to suppose the mind or spirit had been kept *alive* to re-inhabit a house built for it. Not to philosophize about this matter, we regard the objection of the second class, that Br. F. attempts to meet and reconcile, just as we would the objection of an unbeliever in the days of Abraham, who might have said to that Patriarch when about to offer up his son as a *burnt* offering—"Abraham if you thus sacrifice your son the promise of a multitudinous posterity through him can never be realized; for if God raise him up from the dead, as you say, it will not be your Isaac—it will only be one *like* him; and you can never know certain that it is Isaac that God promised should '*come forth out of thine own bowels;*' surely it will not be *that* Isaac, and God's promise will fail after all."

The truth is, unbelief is never satisfied, and never can be. All we have to inquire is—What has God said? Has he said he will raise *the dead?* Has he told us that any part of *man* is exempt from death? Has he said, that in order to enable him to raise the dead, *man* must be only *half* dead? If so, there is to be only *half* a resurrection; for that which is not dead cannot be raiaed to *life.*

The expression "breath of *lives*" (Gen. 2: 7) is not expressive of a "*double life.*" The original is *ha'yim*, and is the same in Gen. 7: 22, where, in speaking of the death by the flood, "of fowl, of cattle, beasts and every creeping thing, and every man," it is added, "all in whose nostrils was the breath of *ha'yim.*" The expression, Gen. 2: 7, therefore, imports nothing more than that man was made to live by the same breath which was common to fowls, beasts and creeping things. It was the breath of *all lives*, or of every living creature as well as man. Many examples of this truth might be urged from the scriptures, but we think this is sufficient.

As to the text with which Br. F. starts, Job 34: 14–15, we think it is God's *spirit*, and God's *breath* that is there spoken of. In the previous chapter, verse 4, Elihu had said, "The *spirit* of God hath made me, and the *breath* of the Almighty hath given me life;" thus showing how we are created and by what means *man* lives. Then, in the same discourse, he says, "If he (God) set his heart upon man, if he (God) gather unto himself *His* spirit and *His* breath," [by which *man* was "*made*" and had "*life,*" what would be the result?] "all flesh shall perish together, and *man* shall turn again unto dust." That would be *man's* destiny, if God withdraw *His* spirit and breath from man. This text, therefore, we regard as decidedly against the idea of a "*double life*" in man. The same explanation is applicable to Isa. 42: 5, as to that by Elihu. For our view of Zech. 12: 1, the reader is desired to turn to the Examiner for last year, page 170. The text means no more than God formed an *intelligent* being, with mind—a mind of an higher order than other animals. The text Job 32: 8, expresses the fact that there is a spirit—*roaakh*—mind "in man," in consequence of which he is capable of receiving "the inspiration of the Almighty," and so obtain "understanding;" but proves nothing of a distinct entity, or real being in man, called a spirit. The very idea, to us, is a palpable absurdity. Man is *man*, and not *two* men. This notion has filled the theological world with confusion. "The spirit of man within him" is the *mind*, and not an entity. "Our spirit" with which "the spirit bears witness," is *our mind.* "Understanding and knowledge are ascribed to" *man* AS MAN. If there is in us an entity, called a spirit, that is capable of receiving "understanding and knowledge" independent of our organization, let it be *proved.* It never has been proved; though it has been and still is often *assumed.* Again we say, man is man—he is a *unit;* when, therefore, it is said—"the spirit beareth witness with our spirit," it is but saying, that its testimony is in agreement with our own consciousness of the fact.

The text Eccl. 3: 21, taken with its context proves just the reverse of the suggestion of Br. Frisbie; it proves that man and beasts "all have one breath"—*rooakh*—spirit, or breath, "so that man hath [in death] no pre-eminence above a beast, * * all go to one place." Surely, in the very next verse he does not contradict himself! A foolish man might, but a man wise as Solomon did not do it; hence he did not affirm (verse 21) what is so often alleged, viz: that man's spirit goes up and a beast's down at death! No: the verse is an affirmation of the truth of what he had just said—"Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast," [in death;] "all go to one place." He then challenges any man to produce the knowledge in evidence that the spirit of the one goeth upwards and the other downwards at death. The verse is a question and challenge. "*Who knoweth* the reverse of what I have just stated?" That this is the sense is obvious from the context, and also from the 9th chapter, where he affirms "there is *no knowledge* in *sheol*"—in the state of the dead.

On Eccl. 12: 7, the same remarks are applicable that we have made on Job 34: 14–15. "*The* Spirit" may be understood of the Spirit of God, by which man was made of the dust of the ground, which, when God resumes or withdraws to himself, "who gave it," *man* shall return to the dust as he was. We are further confirmed in this view from the language of Solomon in Eccl. 8: 8, "No *man* hath power over *the spirit* to retain the spirit * * * in the day of death." Here *the man* is one, and the spirit is another. *The man* cannot control the spirit. It leaves *the* man—God withdraws His spirit—man dies; and unless God again "sendeth forth" His

"Spirit," they will remain dead. See Psa. 104: 29–30.

"Her *spirit* came again," Luke 8: 55, evidently means no more than the spirit of *life;* i. e., she *revived.* In this sense the term spirit is often used. Thus it is said of Sampson, when he was fainting with thirst, Jud. 15: 19, "when he had drunk his *spirit came again,* and he revived." Also, 1 Saml. 30: 12, it is said of a man who was found faint in the field, that they made him drink water, and gave him figs and raisins to eat, "and when he had eaten, his spirit came again to him:" i. e., his vitality, or vital energy, was restored. So in Luke 8: 55, Jesus said, Maid, arise, and her vital energy returned, and she arose straightway.

The "grain of wheat," 1 Cor. 15: 36–37, to our mind, teaches an actual death; and that whole chapter is a clear statement of no future life without a resurrection; and that the first Adam was *not spiritual,* (verse 46,) but was of the earth, earthy, (v. 47,) and such are they also who are only of the first Adam, (v. 48.) We do not question but what there is a "germ" from which God will bring up the resurrection man; but admitting that to be a fact, it does not prove that germ is a living spirit; it is quite as likely the germ is to be found in some portion of the bodily organization, which the power and omniscience of God preserves till the time it shall come forth at the call of the Son of God, quickened once more by the life-giving Spirit of God.

"Your life is hid with Christ in God," Col. 3: 4, has no bearing on the subject to favor the view of the spirit of man being alive when *the man* is dead, as we can see. Paul was addressing christians who were living; not talking about "disembodied spirits." The life of these living saints, to whom he wrote, was *then* "hid with Christ in God;" hence, he adds, "When Christ, who is our life"—the author of that life of which he spake—"shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Christ never did—and we have no authority for supposing he ever will—appear a "disembodied spirit." The christian's life spoken of in this text is clearly that eternal life of which Christ is the author, and which he is coming again to bestow on those who now "die unto sin." This "life exists when the" *man* is dead, who dies united to Christ. To say, simply, it "exists when the *body* is dead," it seems to us, falls short of the truth.

To say "these spirits will God bring with him"—Christ—is not speaking, in our judgment, as the oracles of God. God brought Christ "from the dead," (Heb. 13: 20,) and Paul assures the Thessalonians that so certain as "Jesus died and rose again, even so *them* also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him"—from the dead, of course; for that was the place from which "God brought that great Shepherd of the sheep." The apostles teaches us that this work is a work of resurrection; for, saith he, "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the *dead* in Christ [not the *alive*] shall rise first, then *we* who are alive, and remain—unto the coming of the Lord—shall be caught up together with *them* [the resurrected ones] to *meet* the Lord in the air." Their spirits did not come down from heaven with Christ; but the *dead* saints are "brought again from *the dead*" at the voice of Christ and by the power of that Eternal Spirit which brought Christ from thence. Thus, when Christ returns from heaven, "whether we wake or sleep," i. e., dead or living, *then* shall we "live *together* with him:" i. e., when he returns—not before; for the life spoken of is eternal life—"Christ dieth no more;" and they who are accounted worthy to attain that age, *and* the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more. Luke 20: 35–36; Rom. 6: 9; 1 Thess. 4: 14, 16, 17.

Having said thus much on the subject suggested by Br. Frisbie, we leave it for each one to satisfy his own mind as to what is truth on the topic; feeling assured, however, that Br. F. will find our opponents will give us no rest by such admissions as he suggests for any length of time; and we fear he will find it is only an apology for their unbelief and lack of knowledge of the *power* of God, and will be used by them to push the admission that the spirit lives, when men are dead, to an acknowledgment that it is also conscious. We could very easy believe the latter if we admitted the first. But we firmly believe *the man* is dead—in other words, the entire life of the man is suspended; and if there is no resurrection, there is no future life.

———o———

Elder Jacob Blain's Labors.

Lanesborough, Mass.

Br. Storrs:—I will comply with your request, and give a brief account of my labors in spreading the doctrine of the "Final Destruction of the Wicked," among the churches of every sect where I travel. I design to show no preference to denominations, and find my feelings in this respect much changed since I found I had clung to a gross error forty years, after I trust I loved the bible, and tried, though too idly, to understand its teachings. My motto is, forbear, forget, forgive, in matters which do not directly affect the salvation of man.

I spent five Sabbaths with the Baptist church in Pownal, Vt., while Br. Batchelor, the Pastor, was absent. I found Br. B. had, for several years, been mildly and prudently introducing the doctrine of destruction, and that most of the church believed it. I preached four times directly on the subject, and named it in about every sermon. I visited most of the members, and could hear of but two that did not cordially acquiesce in my views. The church is better united, and far better agreed in, and attached to

their beloved Pastor, than are most of the churches in our land. Thus the repeated reports I heard, that this doctrine had divided and most ruined the church, I know to be unfounded. I rejoice to know there is one Baptist church in the United States, which I believe will never consent to hear the doctrine of *Endless Misery* preached again by a pastor, and which I trust will stand a permanent beacon-light to other churches. The Lord in mercy visit it with a shower of grace, and awaken them from the lukewarm state into which most of our churches are fallen.

Purposing to visit New York and Philadelphia, I concluded to lecture in most of the villages on the route to Bridgeport, Conn. I lectured four times at Williamstown, sold and gave a number of your "Six Sermons," and Dobney's work, and induced a few who believed my views before, and a few who adopted them while I was there, to send for forty more of the "Six Sermons," to give to students and others. Prof. Hopkins had read Dobney, and paid me a kind visit, raised no objections to my views, but said he designed to read the Bible through with special reference to the doctrine of Destruction, or the true penalty of God's law. My visits with ministers would be delightful, instead of aggravating, if all would treat me, and not *my* doctrine, but God's truth, with like respect. Dr. Hopkins, President of the college, frankly admitted, in a pleasant conversation I had with him, that the parable of Dives afforded no proof of endless misery. For this I shall ever remember and respect him, as he is the first and only minister I have found who would admit it. They will allow that Dives, if a real person, must come out of *hades*, (the grave,) at the judgment, and be a tare, a goat, and to die "the second death," and, as "chaff, be burned up." Yet, when I ask, what proof, then, the parable is of eternal torment, they evade an answer, but betray confusion—a confusion that honesty is not troubled with.

I next lectured three times at North Adams, a village of four thousand inhabitants; once, in a public hall, to a good assembly, who listened attentively for an hour and a half—twice in school houses. Here I met with encouragement in a little incident which I will relate, to encourage others to "sow seed," &c. Riding two miles in a stage, while in Vermont, I gave your "Six Sermons" to a lady of fashion, who said she resided here. In four weeks, when I came here, I found she and her husband had warmly embraced its doctrines—lent it to a Justice of the Peace, a Baptist brother, who also was converted to the truth by it, and had lent it to a friend, who was yet reading it with interest; and there I left the straggler, in hopes of hearing more from it when I visit the place again, or learn at the judgment the good it has done. You will conclude I grudged not the three cents the straggler cost me.

Br. Benton and a few others here seemed discouraged, but they will have more to sympathize with them, as I sold and gave some twenty of the Sermons, and several members of the churches seemed determined to renounce their hell-fire doctrine. I called on a minister who boasted of knowing Greek, as he had been a missionary to Greece, and so thought he could convince me that the original words translated, *forever, forever and ever, everlasting and eternal*, meant unending time. Though I knew nothing of Greek, I had the hardihood to tell him that I could show him two hundred places in the Bible where facts show, and he would admit, that these terms are used in a limited sense, or did not tell unending time; and for him to use any Lexicon, Greek or English, to contradict the Bible, was serious presumption. O! when will ministers study the bible instead of dictionaries and commentaries, to learn the meaning of terms used there. But this would take more time; and I fear, yea, and know, as to myself, that idleness has too much to do in the matter. Solomon says, "there is nothing new under the sun," so there must be "lazy dogs" yet somewhere. Have we not lived long enough on dead men's brains?

At South Adams, I lectured three times—once in a free church, and twice in the basement of the Congregational house, used for a school—had a good attendance one night, and a few seemed convinced, &c. The two ministers seemed very decided in their old theory, treated me coldly, but took books and promised to read them, as two did at N. Adams, where the Methodist preacher fought me by preaching hell torment before I left.

At Cheshire, a flourishing village, I lectured twice in the Universalist house, to good assemblies, and twice in school houses. Here quite an interest was felt in my doctrine, and some Baptists and Methodists became about decided in my views, who, with the few advent brethren, agreed to send for forty of the "Six Sermons" to give away. The Baptist minister, an old acquaintance, treated me kindly, and took works to read, but would not have me occupy their basement, nor come to hear me.

In Pittsfield, my views had not been broached, as I found no Advent brethren there. I paid $3 for a hall, and gave notice by handbills, which announced my views, and made many gaze as at an elephant—and so, when they read their bibles in future, they may inquire what destruction means. A number were in attendance, and some were quite interested, and took books. So the leaven is there, and may work.

At Ganesborough, I have lectured three times, and some have expressed belief in the doctrine, which was new to them, as there is but one advent brother in town, and he had taken no paper but the Herald, yet adopts my views. The Baptist minister could not keep his temper, and told me he wanted none of my help—thought he knew all about the subject, but

finally cooled down so as to take the Six Sermons and Dobney. As the select committee had offered me the Town house, I said to myself you will have my *help* in the place, if none of the ministers desire it, for Roger Williams did not advocate liberty of conscience in vain, in this State. I leave to-day, March 1st, for Great Barrington, and may stop some time in Connecticut.

From Pownal to Pittsfield, thirty miles, I have scattered one hundred and sixty of your "Six Sermons," fifty of Dobney, and four hundred tracts—and design, if Providence permits, to return this way in a few months, to learn how the leaven works.

Yours in hope of life by Christ, the only true source of life.

PHILA. BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

LETTER FROM DR. I. F. LEE.

Meltonsville, Anson Co., N. C., Feb. 14, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—I read, with some degree of pity and surprise, in the Examiner of this month, the assumptions and assertions of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. Peter and Paul, James and John, were surely among the first Christians, and yet they never once mentioned either *Berosus* or Herodotus as authority for the truth of that doctrine, which they proclaimed as the voice of God. Indeed, holy men of old, such as Moses, David. and Ezekiel, and Malachi, have proclaimed the same truth, viz. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die—all the wicked will he destroy—the day that cometh will burn them up, so that it will leave them neither *root* nor *branch*." How strange, then, that *Berosus* never mentioned, nor even noticed, the destruction of the wicked! Surpassing strange in the judgment of Baptists! who cannot perceive any show of evidence in the New Testament for it, when Jesus Christ and his Apostles have so forcibly and fully declared it. Had the Association impartially examined the doctrine, they would have come to the conclusion that *it does seem impossible* any ground is left for any intelligent or *sane* person to question the utter destruction of the wicked, or mistake it for their eternal preservation. But they keep their eyes fixed on the smoke that ascendeth up forever and ever, with an intensity of horror, until everything becomes so murky, cloudy, smoky, that their sight is lost, or, if not, so foggy that they cannot see the words consume, bruise, devour, destroy, cease to be, come to nought, perish, utterly perish, die, death, second death, destruction, everlasting destruction, perdition.

But *Berosus*, priest to Belus, never mentioned it! *Ergo*, the Baptists of the Association of Philadelphia, in the year 1851, do not believe, that God will destroy all the wicked, or that the wicked will utterly perish! Oh! how exceedingly, surprisingly strange when it is well known, that the Book now extant under the name of Berosus, *the idolatrous priest*, speaks of kings that never existed, and is a suppositious fabrication, a stupendous fiction—almost equal to, but not quite so wicked as, the *immortality of sinners.*

Nor is this the only strange thing in the Circular Letter, &c. Milton is made to help, by his blank verse, Satan himself to tremble at the evidence of his hopeless case. Is it possible that *the Berosus*, to whom the Association appeal, is the *same* that was priest to Belus? If so, surely it would be a great favor conferred on Baptists throughout the Phil. Association to inform them that the Temple of Belus was the most ancient and magnificent in the world; that it was originally the Tower of Babel; that Belus was made a god after his death! was worshipped with much ceremony by the Egyptians and Babylonians! It would seem that at *this tower*, and in *this temple*, not only language but intelligence was confounded, and intellectuality itself destroyed. What can we then say of those professors of religion who hold forth to the christian community such a being as Berosus as good authority for their *creed?* Perhaps in their next circular we may find them appealing to Pluto, Bion and Druso—and, Druso-like, read it first to their brethren, in order to gain their applause and approbation! There is a very weighty man in the Pee Dee Association, who would be delighted, *no doubt*, with the circular, and might be led, with many others, to believe that Berosus was an able commentator and disciple of MOSES! The gross weight of this man must be considerably over 230 lbs. He is very zealous in his way—for he put a copy of the Bible Examiner Extra, pamphlet form, in the fire, and the fire consumed it. His name is P. C. C., an Elder of the Baptist denomination. He once told me he would write to you, and prove something, I forget what. Has he ever written? He has proved that he destroyed a Bible Examiner—absolutely burnt it. And D. H. burnt a copy of "Can you believe." These are the only pamphlet burners I know in this country. Let these pamphlet-burners do their work, and know that they are effectually aiding the spread of the scripture doctrine of Future Punishment. The doctrine as declared by the sacred writers, by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and believed and proclaimed by Dobney, Storrs, Moncrieff, Lees, White, Cook, and others, is rapidly spreading, and cordially believed by many of different denominations, who have as little of weakness, instability, or want of intelligence, as any one man in the Baptist Association of Philadelphia. I have distributed nearly all the pamphlets—those remaining on hand I will distribute as I go to Charleston, S. C., next month. The doctrine is not struggling for existence—it has a firmer, surer, more enduring foundation than the orthodox, so called, would have the credulous to believe. In truth, it is the orthodox notion of eternal misery that vainly struggles for existence, but will ere long disappear as sure as the

light of the gospel gains admittance into the heart of believers.

If I mistake not, these pamphlet-burners, who will not believe the truth, that God will destroy all the wicked, and preserve all them that love him, are very *weak* and *irritable* and *intolerant*.

They are *so weak*, they loose at once their ire,
And throw the Examiner in the fire;
Then lift their eyes to see the smoke ascend
Forever and forever, without end.
And the pamphlet. O! the thought is glorious!
It is *consumed*—and they are victorious!
But presently another doth appear,
And another daily throughout the year,
So that the Bible Examiner stands,
Even in this country and distant lands,
Most surely fixed upon Eternal Truth—
A guide to wisdom for our rising youth.

I wish the Bible Examiner could be issued weekly. I will cheerfully give $5 for that purpose. Will not every subscriber be willing to do the same? I do hope so.

But, my dear brother, what do you think of the Prince of Poets helping and inspiring Satan himself? Is not this almost the greatest miracle on record? Is it not equal to that of the Saint, who, when about to build a Monastery, happened to see the devil, bound the old boy with his girdle—turned him forthwith into an *ass*, and made him (aye, verily, made the devil,) carry all the heavy materials necessary for said monastery—and then let him loose! Surely there is nothing in the lives of the Saints, as written by R—, more incredible than some things in the Circular Letter noticed in the last Examiner.

If Satan were capable of merriment, I am sure he would be convulsed with laughter at the idea that there was anything in Milton's writings calculated to increase his knowledge, or give him anything like so correct an idea of his doom, as he had previous to the birth of the poet; nor am I certain but it may be proved even by the holy bible, that it was Satan himself, or some of his agents, that deceived not only Milton, but the author of the letter, and led them both to believe a lie, i. e., that the wicked will live forever. Let the Baptists and other sects see to this. I need not tell you, my dear brother, that I am well and alive—through mercy I am indeed—and remain, in hope of eternal life through Christ Jesus,

Yours, affectionately and sincerely,

I. F. Lee.

———o———

Response to "Querist."—You quote Eph. 2: 12, and justly conclude, that "Man, outside of Christ, was outside of the covenant." You add, "and without *that* hope, which is a resurrection from the *dead*, as described by Paul, Eph. 1: 18–20." The resurrection referred to in this passage, is that of our blessed Lord, which is indeed the foundation of our hope. The great object of christian hope is *eternal life*. Titus 1: 2. The resurrection of the righteous, "the first resurrection," a resurrection *out of* dead ones, is indeed an object of hope, (Acts 26: 7–8,) as necessary to eternal life. But the holy volume reveals a resurrection "to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. 12: 2. "To condemnation." John 5: 29. To be cast into the lake of fire," which "is the second death." Rev. 20: 12–15. This surely is no object of hope.

I shall not undertake the more than Herculean task to "inform (our friend) how the wicked get a resurrection from the dead *after* they are destroyed with an everlasting destruction," &c. It is unnecessary. It is sufficient to prove from the bible that they will be raised *before* that dreadful doom. This I think I have clearly done in my former article. To these proofs, Dan. 12: 2, and John 5: 29, may be added.

"The darkness which 'has happened in part' to some of those who are inquiring *what is truth?*" I would humbly attempt to remove, by remarking on 2 Thess. 1: 8–9, first, that if this passage proves that the wicked, who will be alive at the coming of Christ, are to stand before him to be judged by him and eternally destroyed at the commencement of his righteous personal reign, this would constitute no proof that those who have died, previous to his coming, will not be raised to "appear before the judgment-seat." There is no inconsistency between such an event and the resurrection and the judging of all the wicked who die antecedently to the second coming of our blessed Lord. How can such an event nullify his plain asseveration that "*all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation?" John 5: 28–29. I do not deny or affirm that some will stand before the judgment-seat of Christ during the millennial reign, and be destroyed eternally; and, consequently, have no resurrection, but I do affirm, nay, not I, but Jesus Christ, that "*all* that are in the graves shall come forth"—and some to "condemnation." I do affirm that the two classes of men who lived in the days of the apostle, now in their graves, "must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men," &c. 2 Cor. 5: 10–11.

Here, it appears, the Spirit of Truth sets before the wicked a far greater "terror of the Lord" than all the woes of the present life, or all the divine judgments previous to the revelation of the Lord Jesus "from heaven in flaming fire." Far be it that we should believe and teach any punishment for sin which God and justice does not require. Far be it that we should deprive perishing men of any inducement to cease to do evil and to learn to do well, that they may live forever, which the divine wisdom and

benevolence has really set before them. There are thousands of the rejectors of the glorious gospel of the grace of God, who have died, who have not yet endured a "sorer punishment" than those who "despised Moses' law" and "died without mercy." They must be raised to suffer it. Heb. 10: 28–29. Secondly. It appears to me to be an error to suppose that the things or purposes for which the Lord will be revealed from heaven, are all to be accomplished at the commencement of his reign. It is perfectly proper to say that he is coming to reign, to do certain things, or to accomplish certain purposes, if he does those things or accomplishes those purposes *in the course of his reign*, or during any part of it. "He must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 1 Cor. 25: 25–26. This will not be until all the wicked are cast into the lake of fire, for this is the second death. Death and Hades are not to be cast into the lake of fire, i. e., are not to be destroyed until after the second resurrection and final judgment. Rev. 20: 14. The glorious restitution of all things to order, spoken by the mouth of God's holy prophets, comprises all these things, as well as the glory of the saints and the establishing of righteousness throughout the earth. If, then, those enemies of God, who will be cut off during the judgments of the Almighty, which are manifestly to precede and extend into the commencement of the personal reign of our Lord, should be raised after the thousand years are finished, and be cast into the lake of fire, I see nothing in 2 Thess. 1: 8–9, which is irreconcilable therewith. If, however, this can be proved, it presents no proof that those of the wicked, who die before the coming of our Lord, will not come forth to the resurrection of condemnation, as he plainly and positively declares. VERITAS.

MACKNIGHT AGAIN.

Philadelphia, March 8, 1852.

BR. STORRS:—Not wishing to intrude too much upon the liberality of your paper, and thinking that "Veritas" has sufficient work for the present month in answering the communication of your female correspondent, and the article from "Querist," yet I would say a few words by way of noticing some of the points in Veritas' article of last month. I agree with him in his first remarks that Scripture is its own best interpreter; and he thinks it explains this resurrection to mean out of or from among dead ones, which implies leaving some *dead*. This is admitting all that I ask. It now remains for Veritas to show that there will be a subsequent resurrection to the one above spoken of, which he has failed to do. Revelation 20 will not do; there are too many symbols in that chapter to explain that portion which relates to the resurrection literal, and there are too many opinions in relation to the interpretation of that "book for me to build my faith" upon any of them; in most of the book, yea, in all, the Dragon power spoken of is called Pagan Rome; but in this 20th chapter it is made to mean a "devil," or "fallen angel," that is going to deceive the nations at the end of the reign of Christ. How to harmonize this doctrine of the resurrection of the dead that are left behind, and let scripture interprete itself, is more than I can do. Jesus saith, "the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5: 26. "As the Father liveth who sent me, and I live by the Father, even so he who feedeth on me, shall *live by me*." Here is the process by which the righteous obtain life explained by scripture itself; it is a union with the Father and with the Son by the Spirit.

Again. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him again at the last day." Query. Will Veritas show us where scripture promises a resurrection to the wicked some thousand years after "the *last day?*"

The testimony of Paul is also plain, and explains itself. "For if the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he who raised up Christ from the *dead* will make even your mortal bodies alive through his spirit who dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11.

In this passage the Apostle affirms that it required the power of God to raise up Christ from the *dead*, and the same power or spirit is exerted to bring up all the righteous from the *dead*. Now, if this same spirit dwells in, and brings up the wicked, then are they new creatures, and cannot die any more; for, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" and "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature."

Adam was animal; and as such, gave that nature only to his children; 1 Cor. 15; and they died for want of a higher nature to keep them alive, and remain dead; because, "the wrath of God abideth on them." Christ, the second Adam, is a life-giving spirit, and as such, gives this spirit to all that believe on him; and from them the wrath of God is removed, and they come up from the dead, and live by that spirit.

Veritas makes use of the term 'second death,' in the 20th of Revelation, to prove the doctrine of the two resurrections; and says the second death implies that there must have been a first death. Very true; but scripture is its own best interpreter; and it is very remarkable that this second death is nowhere spoken of till we come to this symbolical book, Revelation. Here the second death is said to be the lake of fire. Into this lake the beast and false prophet were cast alive—two symbolical principles; and then the dragon, another principle, was finally cast in, and this lake of fire, or second death, did not consume or kill him, but tormented him day and night forever

and ever. This is not so plain, after all, as Veritas would have us think. But the testimony of Jesus is plain: "Your Fathers ate manna in the wilderness, and are *dead;* but he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." This is plain language; and if the wicked are raised up, as well as those that comply with the conditions, then I confess I can see no meaning in the English language.

MACKNIGHT.

FROM RUFUS WENDELL.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Feb. 4, 1852.

BR. STORRS:—The Examiner reaches me regularly, and I feel a deep interest in its contents. If I were to make a suggestion, (which, however, I do not think proper,) I would be inclined to say—give me more matter from your own pen.

I have Dobney's unabridged work, "The Unity of Man," your "Six Sermons," and Read's pamphlet on Immateriality. I keep them all at work.

Dobney's work has been lent to four preachers—three Methodist and one Lutheran. The stationed Methodist preacher in this village sent it back last Saturday. I conclude he has read it, from the fact that he has, in seven places, put down his vetoes on the margin with lead pencil. But they amount to nothing, not being even *suggestive* of a reply to any of Dobney's arguments. Such *evasions* only confirm me in the conviction, already deep and settled, that "Immortality *only* through Christ" is the Bible doctrine. The opposite dogma cannot stand before plain scripture or sound reason. I desire to spread the truth on this subject, and for this purpose I order tracts of you to give away.

I have recently withdrawn from the M. E. church, because I wish to enjoy the *privilege* of taking God's word as the rule of my faith, and am unwilling to subscribe to a traditional notion that robs Christ of half his glory, and the resurrection of *all* its importance.

FROM DR. R. WILLARD.

Oswego, Ind., Jan. 18, 1852.

BR. STORRS:—We feel an increasing interest on the subject of the Advent, and kindred truths; and feel committed in their advocacy. We can say with the great Apostle that we are not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation. But a view of our great unworthiness should keep us humble, lest we be puffed up with our fleshly minds, and forget the hole of the pit from whence we were digged.

The pamphlets you sent me are nearly all distributed. Some, I hope, have proved to be seed sown in good ground. Our faith, however, is so radically different from that of the churches, that but few are so credulous as to investigate the subject, but throw aside any treatise which conflicts with their former views, and hence the doctrines of Life and Death and the sleep of the dead are not, as a general thing, examined, except by the serious-minded lover of truth, or by those whose minds have been shaken in view of the unreasonableness of the orthodox faith, and who have in consequence settled down in partial infidelity. This class of people have been branded by the professing world as infidels and sceptics, and have been made, as it were, "scape goats" for their sins. But I apprehend many of this infidel class are the most honest and conscientious of the two. The Protestant world have become nearly as much stereotyped in their doctrines as the Catholics are, and in fact they hold some of the monstrosities of religious error in common with the Papal world. Now these so-called infidels, or many of them at least, I have no doubt, have acted in all good conscience; they could not brook the palpable absurdities of the common faith, and hence have stood aloof, choosing rather to trust in sovereign mercy than embrace human error. This class I find will more generally listen to scripture proof and rational argument. And hence it is to the non professing world that our messages of love and mercy will find access and prove salutary.

A LETTER FROM DR. DICK.—Some months since, a paragraph was extensively circulated, that Dr. Dick, the eminent Scottish Christian philosopher, was dead. A friend in Albany, who was in the habit of corresponding with him, ceased writing to him, and thought of him only as having passed from time to eternity. About three months ago, this friend was assured that Dr. Dick still lived, whereupon he immediately wrote to him, requesting him, if he were yet *extant*, to signify it by an early answer. Under date of Feb. 17, 1852, the Dr. writes that he is "*still extant*," and says that for a year and a half past he has enjoyed a tolerable degree of health. After speaking of his literary labors for the few years past, he alludes in conclusion to the present state of public affairs in Europe, and says:

"They present a very strange and frowning aspect. Despotism is now carried to its utmost height in Russia, Austria, Prussia and Germany, and France is under the sway of a tyrant and dictator, who has in the meantime a numerous army at his command. What is to be the ultimate result no one can tell. But we know that the 'Lord God Omnipotent reigneth,' and that the present movements are so many links in the great chain of Providence, leading onward the world's renovation, and to that period when the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh see it together—when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth, and when there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy among all the tribes and families of the earth."

CORRECTIONS.—In Br. Tate's Defence, in Examiner for Nov. 1851, page 164, the thirtieth line from the bottom, left hand column, for "*medicine*" read *medium*. Same paragraph, eight lines above, read *coming* instead "*coining*." In Dr. Fondey's article, last Examiner, page 40, third line from bottom of left hand column, after "*celestial*" insert *power*.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. NEW YORK, MAY & JUNE, 1852. NOS. 5 & 6

THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING.

"To the Christian, indeed, all this doubt would be instantly removed, if he found that *the immortality of the soul, as a disembodied spirit*, were revealed in the Word of God. * * * In fact, however, NO SUCH DOCTRINE IS REVEALED TO US; the Christian's hope, as founded on the promises contained in the Gospel, is *the resurrection of the body.*"—"*Revelation of a Future State*" by DR. WHATELY, Archbishop of Dublin.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN the small volume recently issued by the writer, under the title of "*Life and Death,*" the consideration of the subject of this treatise was designedly waived. Since, however, certain passages of Holy Writ, relating to the *state of man in death,* to which attention is invited in these pages, are popularly considered to be antagonistic to the doctrines there propounded; and since, moreover, no erroneous ideas, with respect to the doctrinal teaching of the Bible, can dwell in the mind without, to some extent, injuriously modifying its apprehension of the entire scheme and details of Biblical truth; and further, since the subject is one of most anxious solicitude to the heart of man; an attempt is made, in the form of popular exposition, to show what is the scriptural testimony on this interesting topic, and which the writer believes will be found to harmonize with the exhibition of revealed truth contained in the volume above referred to.

It is commended to the candid consideration of every student of the Bible, in the hope that it may contribute, in some humble measure, to the formation of correct opinions on what is confessedly an important part of Christian Theology.

Bristol, England, March, 1850.

SECTION I.—INTRODUCTION.

THE inquiry* which the reader is invited to prosecute, is one, it will be readily granted, of very considerable interest to mankind. Ours is not the investigation of some abstract question of mere partial and professional importance—the study of which, while it might contribute to our information, we can yet afford to be ignorant of without very serious disadvantage. On the contrary, it is an inquiry which embraces a period, and the most solemnly affecting period, of our individual history. To be indifferent to this inquiry is not natural to man, for that were to be indifferent to himself. The Patriarch spoke not as an individual, he uttered the anxious voice of the whole species when he asked, "Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"* The awful fact of death has drawn around itself many an anxious inquirer, whose persevering solicitude was not to be suppressed by the silence it maintained, and who has continued to ask, again and again, "Where is he?" It will not be said that the question, if interesting and important, is yet a fruitless one, because the tomb has but echoed the inquiry without answering it. That were a hasty and inconsiderate judgment which should class this among the many profitless speculations which too often engross the frivolous and unpractical mind. Had we still to stand, as did the sages of unaided reason, over every fresh entombment, and repeat the interrogatory to silent death, "Where is he?" the inquiry would not even yet have lost its interest, nor would it have ceased to be urged. Call it not, therefore, an idle speculation; humanity, although unconclaved, are agreed by a separate and instinctive determination to pursue the inquiry. In the absence of an authoritative reply, mankind have furnished their own response, and have dreamed themselves into the belief that their surmisings were the oracle they sought. They have penetrated beyond the tomb into the region of the departed—have unfolded the mystery of death—and have announced the marvellous but complacently received assertion that death is *not* death, but conscious life still, in another and higher form. This must be fancy, for

> "Who can take
> Death's portrait true? The tyrant never sat.
> Our sketch, all random strokes, conjecture all;
> Close shuts the grave, nor tells one single tale.
> Death, and his image rising in the brain,
> Bear faint resemblance; never are alike."

The poet who sang thus, belied his own and the popular orthodoxy, but he is a true witness nevertheless; for thus asks Jehovah of his servant Job—"Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? Or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?" Job 38: 17. So far from glancing through death's opened gates into the impenetrable gloom within, man has not even seen the doors of death. How presumptuous then to talk about the chambers and inmates of that mansion whose dark "shadow" only we have hitherto seen!

* Since publishing my convictions of the doctrinal teaching of the Bible with respect to human immortality, in the small volume entitled "Life and Death," I have read with very great satisfaction, for the first time, the admirable volume of the Rev. H. H. Dobney, on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. An Argument," (second edition,) and which is deserving the careful perusal of every Scripture student. In this work, Mr. Dobney does not formally commit himself to the adoption of any theory upon the subject of the present treatise: he thinks that there are considerable difficulties in the way of every theory extant. He seems, however, to concur in Archbishop Whately's opinion, that the theory which is here advocated is encumbered with the fewest difficulties. "But," he writes, "on the other hand, it also has some serious difficulties to contend with. Among which, passing by those which we may leave pneumatology to suggest, it shall suffice here to allude to the fact already referred to, that Moses, for instance, who had died and been buried as other men, appeared and conversed with Christ on the mount of transfiguration; and the fact that the Saviour promised to the dying thief to be with him *that day* in Paradise (the method of explaining which is scarcely satisfactory;) and again, though we dare not lay much stress on a parable, except for the moral it establishes—Dives is represented by our Lord as in a state of consciousness while yet his brethren lived, as is Lazarus also; while they who have died in the faith generally, are said to be now inheriting the promises, &c.," (p. 134.) Whether I have succeeded in showing that the difficulties suggested are in reality not to be so regarded, must be left to my readers to decide I can only say that they do not appear to be difficulties to me.

* Job 14: 10. The phrase, "giveth up the ghost," is a very awkward one, and adapted to confuse a very simple idea. The Hebrew word signifies "to breathe out," "to expire," "to die." Wemyss translates this passage thus—

> "But when man dies, he moulders into dust;
> When the mortal expires—where is he?
> As the billows pass away with the tides,
> And the rivers, when unsupplied, are dried up;
> So man, composed to rest in the grave, riseth not;
> Till the heavens be dissolved, they will not awake;
> No—they will not rouse up from their sleep."

But the Bible has spoken of death, and volunteers its aid to man, not as a guide, to astonish his vision with its chambers of imagery, but as a teacher, to solve more truthfully than he has done the perplexing problem, "Where is he?" "Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Its answer, and which the language of the patriarch fitly expresses, is emphatic and contradictory of the decisions of the adventurous reason, which, unhappily, have been adopted as the teachings of Scripture by the great bulk of the professing Church: "*As* the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; *so* man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 14: 10–12.

That we may arrive at a common and truthful conclusion, we must understand distinctly the subject of our inquiry. There is reason to believe that many who enter upon this controversy, have not a mutual understanding with respect to the point in debate; and that there would be more unanimity of opinion if care were taken to describe accurately the precise nature of the controversy. On this subject we are in special danger of mixing up human traditions with the verities of revelation; and it is, therefore, of the first importance that we distinguish warily the unequivocal utterances of inspired truth from the speculative deductions of purely human science. Here the caveat of Paul may be urged with special propriety—"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. 2: 8. Here philosophy has, for many ages, usurped the chair of the Great Teacher; and her voice has prevailed above the voice of Him that speaketh from heaven. Here the authority of Plato transcends the authority of Christ—and the dogmas of the Academy, the doctrines of the Bible. We must reverse the Protestant boast in describing the real authority with the Church on this portion of its faith and doctrine, and say, "not Scripture, but tradition."* I am aware that these are grave charges, and I would not be understood to insinuate that the defenders of the doctrines which I have ventured to impugn, knowingly and designedly displace the highest and only authority. I believe that they revere the supremacy of Christ in his Church quite as much as myself, and would be as ready as I am to abandon whatever shall be proved to be contrary to his doctrine. But while I am anxious not to question the sincerity of those who differ from me, I am equally anxious not to be found abetting, by a culpable withholdment of personal conviction, a system of instruction which my conscience dictates to be radically erroneous. The separate existence of the human soul—its immateriality, immortality, and conscious personality, are, I believe, the labored cogitations of human reason, unblest with, and, alas! despite of, the teachings of revelation. They are, in my humble opinion, neither more nor less than the perpetuations of Platonic theories in the Christian Church, which found their way hither in the polemic age of ancient Christianity, and which have been borne down the turbid stream of controversial and scholastic theology to our own day. In proof of this I have only to appeal to the candor of every student of Church history, especially of that important part of Church history which embraces the history and developement of the doctrines. That the doctrines concerning the human soul as popularly held, are not the doctrines of the Scriptures, will be best seen by a careful examination of those passages upon which depends this branch of religious teaching, and to which we propose to advert. Allow me, however, to impress my preliminary caution on the great importance of distinguishing between the teaching of human philosophy, and that of Divine revelation. The question, let it be particularly noted, is not "*What is the human soul—is it capable of a separate existence—and what is its separate state after death?*" This is a purely philosophical, not a religious inquiry, nor has it anything whatever to do with religion, unless the decisions of philosophy shall be accepted as the affirmations of revealed religion, and be acknowledged as part and parcel of it. To this question *Philosophy* has given a categorical reply; the *Bible* nowhere supposes, nor suggests such a question as this, and hence it has given no answer. Let it be especially observed. *Every dogmatic assertion touching the human soul as a separate existence—every predication of its nature, capabilities, and mode of being, is necessarily of no higher value than a human opinion.* I say necessarily, because the Bible neither directly nor indirectly, neither by affirmation nor implication, contains the remotest allusion to any of these ideas. I repeat then, the question is *not*, "What is the separate state of the *soul* after death?" but, "What is the state of *man* after death?" The former question, if it be a proper question at all, properly belongs to the circle of human science, and must be regarded as partaking of the dubious and unsatisfactory character which pertains to psychological investigation. The soul or spirit of man in the popular sense of a disembodied personality, is an idea nowhere recognised, and is evidently unknown to inspired theology.* The Bible nowhere regards the soul of man any more than his body as attaching to itself the human *personality*. When it speaks of man's destiny, and predicates anything concerning *it*, it has respect to the composite being—the unique creature, man. Neither the body nor the soul is separately contemplated; but the one intellectual, sensational and corporeal being called man. I have endeavored in another place† to show that whatever may be the qualities and characteristics of the constituents of man's composite nature, his personality is not involved in either of these constituents separately considered, but in their *union;* and that in the *disunion* of the constituents of his being is involved the dissolution of the personality, or the *man*. Man is an organized being, and like all other organic natures, must owe his existence, we should presume, to his organization. We are not acquainted with any species of organized being, whose individuality survives disorganization; why, therefore, should we suppose, in the absence of any authoritative information, that the case is otherwise with man—that man retains his individuality after his disorganization? Have we not reason to repudiate an opinion which is contrary to analogy, and without the least shadow of support from Scripture? The Patriarch puts the

*This language may appear to some of my readers to need qualification; but I would have such remember, how common is the practice to appeal to the religious opinions of the learned and good men who have adorned the Church in its progressive history. Opinions concerning certain passages of Scripture which are popularly held among believers now, are the opinions which the most eminent divines have embraced for centuries gone by; *therefore*, some say, and most think, these opinions must be correct. What is this but appealing to *antiquity*, which is another name for *tradition?* Protestants, in their controversies with Romanists, deny the authority of tradition; but in their controversies with each other, it is often, as in the present instance, their supreme appeal.

*See Whately's testimony on first page. Also, Bp. Lowth's acknowledgment referred to under sec. 1.

†"Life and Death," Lect. 1.

question in the true theological form, and furnishes a categorical reply at direct variance with the popular creed? "*Man* giveth up the ghost, and where is *he?*" Not where is his soul, or spirit, but where is *he—man?* To which it is replied, "*As* the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: *so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.*" Can imagery and literal assertion more emphatically declare the *complete decease* of the being *man?* and give a more unequivocal reply to the interesting question—"Where is *he?*"—*man*, between death and resurrection? The cessation of man's conscious being is yet further implied in the succeeding question, "If a man die, *shall he live again?*" To which the Patriarch replies, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands."*

SECTION II.—TERMS DENOTING THE LOCALITY OF THE DEAD.

"Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?" Such is Jehovah's challenge to the patriarch Job, and which occurs among that wonderful series of questions by which the Almighty impressed His tried servant with the extreme narrowness and insignificance of human knowledge. The interrogation is equivalent to, "What knowest thou of death, or the dead?" And well had it been for mankind, and for the integrity and practical efficiency of Christianity, had they been content with the knowledge of their ignorance in this solemnly profound direction. We cannot explore the place of the dead—we know not even if there be a *place*, except in the imaginations of men, who because they know that all mankind share a *common experience* in this matter, speak of them as having gone to *one place*. It is the necessity of human thought which is compelled to localize the departed, that has originated a *place*, and a *name* for the place, of the dead. The Hebrews called it *Sheol*, the Greeks *Hades*, and the Saxons *Hell*, words most aptly chosen, since while they subserve the necessity of human thought, they express at the same time the modesty of the human mind which in its election of terms, would, in this instance, appear to approve of the wisdom of not being wise above what is written. The Greek word *Hades*, is of very common occurrence in the Greek classics, but its classical signification is no criterion of its meaning in the sacred writings. We are referred back to the Hebrew *Sheol* for the strict sense in which it is employed by the inspired writers. "The Greek term did not come to the Hebrews from any classical source, or with any classical meaning, but *through the Septuagint* as a translation of their own word; and whether correctly translating it or not is a matter of critical opinion. The word *Hades* is, therefore, in nowise binding upon us in any classical meaning which may be assigned to it. The real question, therefore is, what is the meaning which *Sheol* bears in the Old Testament, and *Hades* in the New? A careful examination of the passages in which these words occur will probably lead to the conclusion, that they afford no real sanction to the notion of an intermediate place of the kind indicated, but are used by the inspired writers to denote *the grave*—the resting place of the bodies, both of the righteous and the wicked."* Let it be borne in mind that nothing relative to the state of of the dead can be ascertained by these words simply and separately considered. In all the three languages they have a common signification—their etymological meaning being the *unseen*, *hidden*, or *unknown* place or state. These terms, then, so far from conveying to us any information concerning the *place* or *state* of the *dead*, only express our own ignorance of these matters, and ought on this account to operate as a perpetual check upon the indiscretion of the rash speculator. Whatever sense the word *Sheol* has in the Old Testament, *Hades*, as its Greek equivalent, will have in the New. The Hebrew prophets, in their allusions to the place and state of the dead, conveyed their ideas in the imagery which was suggested by their mode of sepulture. It is not to the Hebrew writings, but to the Greek philosophy, that we trace the birth of those opinions concerning the state and place of the dead, which at the present time prevail as the orthodox creed of modern Christianity. Such opinions must necessarily be defective, and destitute of any claim on our religious belief, since they partake of the imperfection and uncertainty which characterize all human investigation. They are philosophical traditions, not scriptural informations, and as such ought to be jealously excluded from the sacred domain of inspired authority. It is evident that the Hebrew prophets were strangers to these philosophical opinions—their poetical descriptions of death and the dead show whence their imagery was derived, and suggest that they could form no other conceptions of the condition of the departed, than what the analogies of their mode of interment presented to their view. Bp. Lowth, in his "Lectures on Hebrew Poetry," says, "That which struck their senses they delineated in their descriptions: we there find no exact account, *no explicit mention of immortal spirits*"—a very significant testimony! This testimony is the more important since the Bishop considered that the immortality of the soul as a disembodied existence, was a doctrine known to and acknowledged by the prophets; and he accounts for their uniform silence on this subject, "because they had no clear idea or perception by which they might explain where or in what manner it existed; and they were not possessed of that subtlety of language which enables men to speak with plausibility on subjects abstruse and remote from the apprehension of the senses, and to cover their ignorance with learned disputation. The condition, the form, the habitation of departed spirits were, therefore, concealed from the Hebrews equally with the rest of mankind. *Nor did revelation afford the smallest assistance on this subject.*"†

*Job 14: 10, 12, 14, 15. It is contended by some that this passage from the book of Job is a decided proof that Job had no knowledge of, and, therefore, no hope in a resurrection from the dead. Into this controversy it will be apparent the remarks above do not necessarily enter. I have merely cited the passage to show that in death *man*, in his compound totality, in which he is alone capable of existing, is *no more*. Whatever the Patriarch may have intended by this language, in reference to the resurrection of the dead, there can be but one opinion about his meaning with regard to the *state* of the dead,

*Kitto's Bib. Cyc. Art. *Hades*. Professor Stuart says, "Before the New Testament was written, the translators of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, i. e., the Seventy as they are usually called, had made very frequent use of the word Hades, in order to translate Sheol. They have done this in no less than 60 instances out of the 63 in which the word Sheol is employed in the Hebrew original. Twice they have rendered the same Hebrew word by the Greek term for *death*, viz:—2 Sam. 22: 6; Prov. 23: 14; and once by the Greek term for pit, Ezek. 32: 21. The sense which these translators affixed to it is most evidently the same as the Hebrews affixed to the word Sheol. In the Apocrypha I find the word employed 16 times, and in all cases in a manner that corresponds entirely with the use of Sheol. We are prepared then to expect the like use of Hades in the New Testament."—"Essays on Future Punishment," p. 128–9.

†Dr. Barrow makes a similar statement: "It can hardly be made appear that the ancient Hebrews either had any name appropriated to the place of souls, or did conceive distinctly which way they did go."—Sermon 28, vol. 2.

I would beg the reader's special attention to this paragraph from the pen of the learned Bishop. He acknowledges that the writings of the prophets contain "no explicit mention of immortal spirits"—that they never alluded to *disembodied spiritual existence*, and that "revelation" did not "afford them the smallest assistance on this subject." Is his inference then a *reasonable* one, that the prophets who make no "mention of immortal spirits," *therefore* believed in immortal spirits? and that, although they make no allusion to disembodied spiritual existence, this is to be explained by their inability to express suitably their ideas? And that, notwithstanding "revelation" afforded not "the smallest assistance on this subject," the soul's disembodied existence, as the human personality, and the intermediate state as popularly understood and held, were yet doctrines of revelation? By what unknown process could the Bishop arrive at such conclusions? The sacred writers have said nothing about these doctrines, therefore, says Bp. Lowth, they believed them! I humbly suggest that this negative premiss would be more logically connected with a negative inference; that since the sacred writers have *said nothing* about these doctrines, the probability is that they *knew nothing* about them. Their word *Sheol* drew a veil over the departed state, and involved it in concealment and darkness. If ever they have occasion to refer to the departed, their thoughts are not directed upwards, as if they believed that the personality as a disembodied soul had ascended to God—they think of the *body* and the *tomb*, and associate the departed with that which is buried. Thus, "they shall go down to the bars of the pit, when our rest together is in the dust." Job 17: 16. "Let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." Ps. 69: 15. "My life draweth nigh unto the grave. I am counted with them that go down into the pit. Free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more; and they are cut off from thy hand. Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps." Ps. 88: 3–6. "Therefore, Sheol hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure, and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it." Is. 5: 14. "When I shall bring thee down with them that descend into the pit, with the people of old time, and shall set thee in the low parts of the earth, in places desolate of old, with them that go down to the pit, that thou be not inhabited." Ezek. 26: 20. It seems sufficiently plain that the prophets associate the personality of the departed with the *buried body;* and since the words which they utter are not always their own, but they are frequently the message bearers of Jehovah, as in the citation last given, it seems also plain that God himself points to the *grave* as the temporary abode of the human personality: "Dust *thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*" Gen. 3: 19.

> "That
> Only which comes direct from God, His Spirit,
> Is deathless. Nature gravitates without
> Effort; and so all mortal natures fall
> Deathwards.
> * * * * * * *
> The soul's inheritance,
> Its birth-place, and its death-place, is of earth,
> Until God maketh earth and soul anew;
> The one, like Heaven, the other like Himself."—
> BAILEY'S "FESTUS," p. 37.

The only means we have of estimating the real opinions of the sacred writers on this subject, is the language in which they convey their thoughts. Their opinions must necessarily be of a very indefinite and general character, since the subject is involved in so much obscurity. So much, however, is beyond dispute, that their language instead of indicating their belief in the soul's disembodied and conscious existence, suggests their utter ignorance of such ideas. They spoke as if they believed that the outward image of death and its circumstances were not the fictitious, but the *real* semblance of the state of the departed. Their descriptions of Sheol or Hades are utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that they believed the state of death to be a condition of consciousness and activity.* *All*, irrespective of character, are dismissed to Sheol; "All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Eccl. 3: 20. "All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." Eccl. 9: 2. Sheol is a place of *inaction* and *silence.* "Let them be silent in Sheol." Ps. 31: 17. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol whither thou goest." Eccl. 9: 10.

Sheol is never described except in the imagery of terror, and is always regarded as a great evil. It is never spoken of as the portal of heaven—the gate of immediate bliss to the righteous.† On the contrary, it is described as an awful, unfathomable abyss, extending deep into the heart of the earth, to indicate the completeness of its dominion. "*Deeper than Sheol what canst thou know?*" Job 11: 8. It stands in contrast with heaven; and, therefore, the inhabitants of the one must be distinct and separate from the other. "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there." Ps. 139: 8. "Though they dig into Sheol, thence shall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down." Amos 9: 2.

Now, whatever may be the opinions of uninspired Jewish writers, whether ancient or modern, they can be of no authority in determining the opinions of the Hebrew prophets, whose thoughts, inspired by the Holy Ghost, are conveyed in language sufficiently explicit to indicate their faith and doctrinal instruction on this subject. It is to introduce a novel and

* The popular theology of modern times regards Sheol or Hades as the place of departed souls. Barrow saw the impossibility of adopting this opinion in connexion with the belief in the consciousness of the human soul in its separate state. He thus writes: "If those ancients had by Sheol meant the receptacle or mansions of souls, it is not likely they would have used such expressions as these: 'The grave cannot praise thee.' 'In death, there is no remembrance of thee,' &c., * * * *except souls after death became deprived of all life and sense.*"—Sermon 28, p. 342, vol. 2.

† If at death the righteous are transported as disembodied spirits to the joys of the upper paradise, why should death be always deprecated as a great evil, and deliverance from it, either by checking its advance, as in the case of King Hezekiah, or by miraculous restoration from its power, as in the case of Lazarus and others, be always regarded as a distinguished mercy? When Paul said that he desired "to depart and be with Christ," he did not desire to *die*—it was not a departure in this sense that he coveted; but a departure from his multiplied cares and sufferings; he desired a separation from mortality, and longed for it to be superseded by immortality, which would not be his coveted privilege until he was "with Christ" at the period of the saints' resurrection. Paul did not expect to be "with Christ" as a disembodied spirit between death and resurrection, as is abundantly shown under Sections 6 and 7. Did Paul believe that they "who die in the Lord" are "blessed" in the sense of being consciously happy in death, and not because a glorious resurrection shortly awaited them—then we are at a loss to account for his concurrence with other sacred writers in their estimation of death as a *great evil* instead of a great blessing. For example, speaking of Epaphroditus, his "brother, and companion in labor, and fellow soldier," he says, "he was sick nigh unto death, but *God had mercy on him.*" Phil. 2: 27. Paul evidently thought that it was a greater act of mercy to permit Epaphroditus to live than to die. And this also accords with what he says in another place—"*not that we would be unclothed,*" not, that is, that we would die, "*but clothed upon,*"—have, that is, our resurrection, or "spiritual body," which will be when "this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality."

dangerous canon of biblical interpretation, to affirm, in reference to the present question, that the silence of the sacred writers speaks consent. I presume it will be apparent that the terms denoting the *locality* of the dead, suggests nothing in favor, but rather involve the *denial* of the doctrines of the disembodied soul, and an intermediate state of consciousness for man, between the night of his death, and the morning of resurrection; and, therefore, the logical conclusion is, so far as these terms are concerned, that the origin of such opinions is purely traditional.

SECTION III.—SCRIPTURE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE STATE OF THE DEAD.

There are terms and phrases employed by the sacred writers in their allusions to the state of the departed, which, but for the pre-occupation of our minds by ideas purely philosophical and traditional, would have conveyed the impression that the Scripture doctrine of death is the cessation of the consciousness and activity of the human being. Death is frequently spoken of under the figures of "rest," as "sleep." Thus we read, "They rest from their labor"—"He fell asleep"—"The sleep of death." But it has been said that the analogy between death and taking rest or sleep, supports the belief that there is consciousness in death, since man, in the repose of sleep, is not deprived of all consciousness, although he may be so far deprived of it with respect to the external world.* If, however, the analogy is to be pushed thus far, and viewed so specially in this aspect, we may extend it still further and view it in any other aspect of which it is capable—which I conceive to be the abuse rather than the use of a metaphor. Now, death is alleged to be a *separation* of the soul and body, and that it is the *separate soul* which is conscious and active. Where then is the analogy between the respective states of death and sleep? For surely no one but phrensied poets will affirm that any separation of soul and body takes place in sleep! Most certainly the consciousness of the man in sleep is located in the animal frame.† The figure of sleep, it appears to me, is employed in the Scriptures to point out a very different, but very appropriate analogy. It is adopted, I apprehend, because it suggests that the death which mankind die in this world is not *final*—that it will be succeeded by a resurrection, even as sleep is by a waking time. Thus there was a very evident propriety in our Lord's address to the friends of Jairus, whose daughter they were lamenting as dead, "The maid is not dead but sleepeth;" and again to his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*, but I go that I may *awake* him out of *sleep*." They were both *dead;* for of the mourners in the first case, who did not apprehend his meaning, it is said, "They laughed him to scorn, *knowing that she was dead.*" And our Lord himself said, when his disciples misunderstood the meaning of his remark, and thought that "he spake of taking of rest in sleep"—"Lazarus is dead." He spake of them both as sleeping, because it was so *near* their *waking time* through his miraculous agency. The misapprehension of our Lord's meaning when he used the term *sleep* to denote death, both on the part of the disciples and the mourners, indicates the popular belief of the Jews of that time on the subject of death. The term *sleep*, in their judgment, was most inappropriate to describe the state of the dead, their associations with this subject, inculcated and fostered by their sacred writings, being of a more gloomy and hopeless nature, than the term sleep gave birth to. It is probable, that the beautiful analogy between the awaking from sleep, and the resurrection from the dead, led to the adoption of this term, more especially to describe the death of believers in Christ. They were taught to regard death as a sleep, because their waking time by resurrection was *not far off*—their Lord would "come quickly."

There are, however, other phrases and figures which will baffle the most zealous ingenuity to make them tally with the popular notion of death. We hear sometimes of the emancipated spirit breaking away from the confinement of its gross prison-house, and winging its way in happy freedom to heaven and to God. Of course this kind of speech is used only of the deceased righteous. But how does this notion accord with the scripture phrase, '*the pains of death*?' Death is here described as a *bondage, not* a liberation; for the word "pains" signifies a *cord* or *band*. And it is affirmed that our Lord himself was held in this bondage for a brief period, although it was impossible that he should be the captive of death. The whole passage shows that death is a *binding*, not a *loosing* power—"Whom God hath raised up, having *loosed* the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden to it." Acts 2: 24. He became Death's conqueror, not his captive; and hence he holds by right, and as the symbol of his victory, "the keys of hades and of death;" that, as the Resurrection and the Life, he may, at the appointed time, open the *prison doors* to them that are *bound*.

And no less difficult will be the task to prove that there are animation and consciousness in death, if we resort to other figurative expressions of Holy Writ. In one of David's psalms we have this mournful complaint—"Thou hast brought me into the *dust of death*." Ps. 22: 15. The dust of death! What is there in this phrase to suggest the idea of animation and consciousness? There is, indeed, much to suggest the original curse, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19.

"The shadow of death" is another image by which the state of death is portrayed. "There is no darkness nor *shadow of death* where the workers of iniquity may *hide* themselves." Job 34: 22. Death is here imaged as a place of dark seclusion and concealment. Such a place is surely not a fit intermediate abode for the immortal spirits of the just! It may be a

* An excellent author of a work on Dreams, professes to find in their phenomena probable evidences of the doctrine of a separate state for the human spirit, as the conscious personality of man. The phenomena of dreams are profoundly mysterious, and little or not at all understood; and, surely, there is no argument to be derived thence in favor of such an opinion. The data are too impalpable for the construction of such an argument as this. All I apprehend that is logically proved or provable from the phenomena of dreams is, that the human nature is capable, in sleep, of a state of consciousness distinct from the waking consciousness. Mesmerism exhibits a new phenomenon of human consciousness. We can never allow any force to arguments derived from such an obscure source. The Bible alone can speak definitely on the doctrine of the state of the dead, and to it we supremely appeal. The imperfection of the evidence from any other source than the Scriptures, is acknowledged by the elegant writer above alluded to. "If," he writes, "we are even at all *likely* to exist after death, can it seem a matter of small interest to investigate, as far as may be, what we are to become? * * * * But where shall any light be obtained * * * *except purely from Scripture* sources."—Sheppard on "Dreams, in their Mental and Moral Aspects," p. 76.

It does not follow as a rational inference that man must have consciousness in the state of death, because he is capable of more species of consciousness than one in the state of life. So long as he lives, man may be conscious in whatsoever state he may happen to be, natural or artificial; but death is the temporary destruction of man, and bears no analogy to any condition of the living man.

† Addison in his paper on sleep, thus fancifully writes, "I do not suppose that the soul, in these instances, is *entirely* loose and unfettered from the body; it suffices if she is not so *immersed in matter*, nor so entangled and perplexed in her operations, as when she actuates the machine in her waking hours. *The corporeal union is slackened enough* to give the mind more play."—Spectator, No. 487.

suitable habitation for them who "love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

The "gates of death," (Ps. 9: 13; 107: 18,) like the scripture phrase, the "pains of death," is an image which suggests the idea of a powerfully fortified city or mansion, whose massive gates close in hopeless captivity upon all who pass within them. These analogies are certainly most unhappily chosen by the sacred writers, if they are intended to denote that death procures life and liberty, and a more complete enjoyment for man in the intermediate state.

Let me request the reader's attentive consideration of the following selection of passages, which present, in very definite language, the scripture testimony on the state of the dead:—

"Man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 14: 12. "In death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. 6: 5. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise, and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? Or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Ps. 88: 10–12. "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?" Ps. 89: 48. "Thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, Return, ye children of men." Ps. 90: 3.

The Psalmist, in that beautiful composition from which the preceding text is selected, contrasts the Creator with the creature man. The eternity of God is confronted with the limited duration of man's existence. Thus, "from everlasting to everlasting thou art God," is opposed to "thou turnest man to destruction, and sayest, return ye children of men." Many expositors understand the word translated "destruction" as the poetical term for the word "dust," since its literal signification is "what is beaten to pieces." There is evidently a reference in this passage to the original curse—the returning to the dust. If, therefore, death be but the liberation of the living spirit, and the spirit is the *personality*, or *man*, where is the *destruction* spoken of? "Thou turnest man to destruction." And if the spirit be immortal, where is the contrast between the duration of God, and that of man?

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115: 17. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 4. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Prov. 21: 16. "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." Eccl. 9: 5–10. "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day." Is. 38: 18–19. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. 12: 2. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live." Matt. 27: 52, 53. "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves." Ezek. 37: 12–14. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." John 5: 28.

Now, to endeavor to evade the accumulated force of this scripture array by saying, as is commonly said, that in all these citations the *body*. not the *soul*, is referred to, is to fall back upon the vain philosophy of the *unproved separate state of the soul;* and, also, to make the inspired writers assert most ridiculous truisms. We need not inspired writers to tell us that an inanimate *corpse* cannot remember, and give thanks, and praise, and hope, and know. No one could suppose that the Psalmist was alluding to a dead carcase when he said, "In that very day *his thoughts perish.*" Will our antagonists explain how it can harmonize with their theory of a state of consciousness after death, that in the day of death a man's "*thoughts perish?*"

The method of getting out of the difficulty in which several texts of scripture place the advocate of the immortal and separate soul, by saying, in utter defiance of all consistent exegesis, that *this* text refers to the body, and *that* text refers to the soul, is deservedly characterized as sophistical, unsatisfactory, and suspicious. We will bring this species of lawless exposition to the test in a given case.

In the 2d chapter of Acts, 29th verse, we hear Peter thus reasoning on the day of Pentecost—"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the Patriarch David, *that he is both dead and buried*, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Peter's affirmation is, that David is *dead and buried*—"*he*," the *personality David*, "is both dead and buried." Now, what are we to understand that the Apostle affirms? It is replied, Peter here refers to the *body* of David: his affirmation is equivalent to—the *body* of David is both dead and buried. Well, be it so. *David* means the *body of David.* Now carry this exposition on to the 34th verse of this same chapter, where Peter says—"David is not ascended into the heavens." How are we to interpret this? You reply—if for convenience I may personify my antagonistic type of a numerous class—that Peter tells us, the *body of* "David is not ascended into the heavens." Can you seriously think that Peter "tells us" this? Surely, we need not to be told that David's inanimate body has not ascended into the heavens! "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Surely flesh without blood—a corruptible corpse—could never be supposed to find a mansion there! Besides, Peter has just previously told us that David's *body*, according to your interpretation, is "both dead and *buried.*" Unless, therefore, David had *two* bodies, he could not be supposed to be both in his "sepulchre" and "in the heavens." This is to turn the gravely effective argument of the Apostle into a most meaningless jargon, and to put into his mouth a ridiculous absurdity. However, let this exposition stand upon its own merit, and for what it is worth. You certainly cannot agree with the Apostle's assertion that "David is not ascended into the heavens." You believe that David is in glory—David's soul, his personality—himself, has long been enjoying his heavenly bliss. But pause! You have said, in explanation of verses 29 and 34, that the *body* of David is *David,* and now you say that the *soul* of David is *David.* Were there *two* Davids then, or had the Psalmist a double personality? I anticipate your reply to this—David's *body* is only called David in a secondary and popular sense; properly speaking, the *separate soul* or *spirit* of David is the personality of David, and that *has* "ascended into the heavens." Then why, I ask, does Peter affirm that "David is *not* ascended into

the heavens," if the *separate* soul is properly David, and that separate soul *is* in the heavens? Did Peter not speak *properly*? How are we to know whether he spoke *properly* or *popularly* on this occasion?

Now, there is no difficulty in understanding the sense in which the proper name David is here employed, if men will but keep their "science, falsely so called," out of the question. The Apostle was showing his astonished audience, that the Patriarch David had prophesied of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and he quotes the last four verses of the 16th Psalm in confirmation of his statement. Anticipating the possible objection of some that David in that Psalm spake of *himself*, and *not* of the Messiah, the Apostle reminds them that the statement, "Thou wilt not leave my soul (life) in hades (grave,) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," could not refer to David, because *his life was* under the *power of the grave*, and *his body had seen corruption*. "The Patriarch David is both dead and buried, and the sepulchre is with us unto this day." Therefore, some other must have been referred to, to whom these circumstances can apply; and Peter assures them that they were fulfilled in Christ of whom David prophesied: "He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that *his* soul was not left in hades—(his life was not left under the power of death)—neither *his* flesh did see corruption." And when David added, "Thou hast made known to me the *ways of life;* thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance," he prophesied of the rising from the dead, and the ascension into the heavens of Jesus Christ, that he might make plain "the ways" or path "of life," and behold "the countenance" of his Father in his peoples' behalf. For the proof that this language could not apply to David, he appealed to their common sense, and, may I not add, to the theological opinions of the time on this subject? and said, "For *David is not ascended into the heavens;* but he saith himself, the Lord said unto *my Lord*, sit *thou* on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool."

It is, I think, apparent that Peter's argument requires us to understand, that *David himself*, the "*Patriarch* David," *not* simply his body, was "dead and buried," and that David in no sense had "ascended into the heavens."

Therefore, if the Patriarch David has no conscious life in the intermediate state, but is awaiting the manifestation of the life which is at present *hidden* in Christ, (Col. 3: 3–4,) the Life and the Light of men, and which shall take place at the resurrection, when Christ shall come to be glorified in his saints; if this, we say, be the case of the sweet Psalmist of Israel, we may fairly presume that the case is the same with all others. Then the Scriptures teach that although in the midst of life we are in death—in the midst of death we are *not* in life.

SECTION IV.—CHRIST'S MIRACLES ON THE DEAD.

The three recorded miracles of our Lord which he wrought on the deceased daughter of Jairus, the Son of the widow of Nain, and Lazarus, contain nothing in their mode of execution, and other attendant circumstances, that give the least shadow of support to the popular theory relative to the condition of the dead. The manner in which they are recorded by our Lord's historians, if it suggests anything at all, suggests rather that the modern theological anthropology was unrecognized by the Church in apostolic times, that dissolution was not then believed to be a dissolving of the composite nature of man into the constituent elements of his being, leaving the conscious life of man entire, *resident in one* of these constituent elements—but that it was the dissolution, in the sense of the actual decease, of the *man* himself. When man dies, "in that very day," says the Psalmist, "his thoughts perish"—the thinking being ceases to be. There is no calling upon the departed spirit, as a conscious ethereal embodiment, to return again to the fleshly tabernacle; the lifeless form is the object of attention and address, and the terms denoting personality are applied to *it*. Thus in the case of the deceased daughter of Jairus, it is said that our Lord "took the damsel *by the hand*, and said unto her, *Talitha cumi*, which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto *thee*, arise, and straightway the damsel arose."*

Standing by the bier of the widow's son, our Lord thus addressed the deceased—"*Young man*, I say unto *thee*, arise. And he that was dead sat up." Luke 7: 14–15. And similar is the style of address to the dead Lazarus—"*Lazarus*, come forth, and he that was dead came forth." John 11: 43–44. And in the raising of Dorcas and Eutychus, there is nothing said or done that could suggest such an idea of the state of the dead, as that which now so extensively and injuriously prevails. I am aware it may be said that this style of address to the dead in the instances just cited, is to be regarded as popular, and that a mere philosophical mode of expression would have been unnecessary and inconvenient. This reply, however, contains the implication that the popular and the philosophical in the present case are at *variance*, which must be proved. Granted that it was the popular style of address, it is very obvious that what was popular with our Lord and his contemporaries, is *not* popular with us. We detach, by almost universal consent, the idea of personality from the corporeal part of man, and speak of the soul as retaining the personality. Let the reader recal to mind the usual inscriptions upon our gravestones in exemplification of the discrepancy between the language of modern and ancient Christianity. "Here lieth *the body* of," &c.; "here lieth the *mortal remains*," &c.† Peter did not say on the day of

* Mark v. 41–42. Luke in his account of this miracle says, "And *her spirit came again*, and she arose straightway." Ch. 8: 58. This passage will come under consideration in a subsequent section.

† The very interesting and valuable work of Dr. Maitland furnishes many examples of the Christian mode of inscribing places of sepulture, so early as the first century. The extensive catacombs of Rome were used by the Roman Christians as a place of refuge during the long season of their severe persecutions under the emperors. They also afforded a convenient burial place, and were commonly used for this purpose. "The number of graves contained in the catacombs is very great. In order to form a general estimate of them, we must remember from the year 98 A. D., to some time after the year 400, (of both which periods consular dates have been found in the cemeteries,) the whole Christian population of Rome was interred there. As this time includes nearly a century after the establishment of Christianity under Constantine, the numbers latterly must have been very considerable. A city peopled by more than a million of inhabitants, so far christianized as to give rise to a general complaint that the altars and temples of the Gods were deserted, must have required cemeteries of no ordinary dimensions." In the latter part of the 16th century, these catacombs were eagerly plundered of the tablets and blocks containing the ancient sepulchral inscriptions, and distributed in the museums of the learned. The chief collection of these exhumed relics, is in the long corridor of the Vatican Museum. The following are among these ancient inscriptions, which the reader will perceive to exhibit obvious points of *contrast* with modern Christian memorials of the deceased.

"THE PLACE OF PHILEMON."
"VIRGINIUS REMAINED BUT A SHORT TIME WITH US."
"VIDALIO, IN THE PEACE OF CHRIST."
"VICTORINA, IN PEACE, AND IN CHRIST."
"DORMITIO ELPIDIS"—the *sleeping place of Elpis.*
"VICTORINA SLEEPS."
"ZOTICUS LAY HERE TO SLEEP."

Pentecost, "the *body* of David," but "*David* is both dead and buried." Let him reflect also upon the modern conventional phraseology with respect to the dead, and he will see that *our language*, and, as language is but the vehicle of thought, that *our thoughts* also are widely discrepant with those of the early believers. Thus we say, "My departed friend," "My departed parent," "He departed this life," by which we mean that the *soul*, which we consider to be the *friend* or *parent*, has *departed from the body*, as from its temporary and earthly home. Now, such a phraseology as this, and with such a signification, is nowhere to be found in the Bible. We read, indeed, of the mournful death of Rachel, that "As her soul (life) was in departing, (for she died,) that she called," &c. Gen. 35: 18. But Moses does not seem to have attached such an idea to his language, "as her soul was in departing," as that which it has in modern usage—he does not seem to have imagined that her soul was herself, set free from the body to enjoy a purer life; so far was he from conceiving that the personality of Rachel was *resident* in her departing soul, that he puts in a parenthesis *his* idea of what had become of her personality, "for," he says, "she died"—she, the personality Rachel—died.

But it may be objected, that whatever may be said of the discrepancy between the popular modes of thought and speech of primitive and modern believers on this subject, it is sheer absurdity to suppose that our Lord and his Apostles actually addressed unconscious matter and mere nonentities. But this alleged absurdity is an unreasonable charge; it may have the appearance of absurdity to us who are ignorant of the mysterious processes by which the effect is accomplished. We are informed that the original creation was effected by the agency of Jehovah's "word." "He *spake* and it was done." Thus God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." So far from there being any absurdity in speaking of, or to non-existences, Paul has the following passage, "God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were." Rom. 4: 7. This passage is in point, and rebuts the allegation of absurdity. The last clause of this text is not distinct from the former, but is in apposition to it; and hence is explanatory of the state of the dead. Let it be observed that in the first clause the Apostle says, "God who quickeneth the dead." Now, to quicken, or make alive the dead, is to us a profoundly incomprehensible act; it is to call "things which be *not*, as *though* they were;" it is to command that which *is not* into that which *is*. Hence the Apostle to his remark, "God who quickeneth the dead," adds, and which was suggested by that remark, He "calleth those things which *be not* as though *they were*." And since this last clause is explanatory of the preceding, it informs us what death is. *That which is dead* is, philosophically and on the authority of an inspired writer, *that which is* NOT.

It is deserving attention that in each case of the miraculously revived dead, there is all the appearance of the having come from a state of unconsciousness, a waking as from a profound sleep; thus verifying, as far as appearances enable us to judge, the truth of Solomon's statement—"The dead know not anything," (Eccl. 9: 5;) and also the Psalmist's characterization of the place of the dead, when he terms it "The land of forgetfulness." Ps. 88: 12.

SECTION V.—CHRIST'S DISCOURSES CONCERNING THE DEAD.

The discourses of our Lord concerning death and the dead exhibit the same uniform phraseology, and suggest precisely the same ideas as in the last section, on his miracles on the dead. For example, "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the grave—(not, all the disembodied spirits in heaven)—shall hear his voice and shall come forth." John 5: 28–29. "I will raise *him*—(not his body)—up at the last day." John 6: 40, 44, 54. Christ said to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." John 8: 56. Not understanding in what way Abraham had seen the day of Christ, and supposing that our Lord referred to some occasion when he professed to have been with Abraham, they replied, "Thou are not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" John 8: 57. The form in which the Jews put their question to our Lord is not a little remarkable. Had they believed that their father Abraham, as a disembodied spirit, was in heaven, it would not have been so much a cause of surprise to them that Christ might have seen Abraham, though he was "not yet fifty years old," since he had but just declared to them, in the course of the same conversation, that he was "from above," and that he "proceeded forth and came from God." But they do not appear to have had the faintest shadow of an idea of such a doctrine as *a condition of life for the human being* between death and the resurrection; and hence they express their astonishment that a person not fifty years old should profess to have seen Abraham, who had been dead several hundred years. Whatever may have been their philosophical notions about the separate state of the human soul, they do not appear to have entertained the belief that the separate soul is the conscious personality of the human being. I cannot otherwise understand why they should measure the age of Christ with the long interval since the Patriarch's death, and in effect affirm that to have seen Abraham he need to be upwards of eighteen hundred years, instead of "not yet fifty years old." "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" Let it be observed that our Lord had said to the Jews during this conversation, "I am from above." "I am not of this world." John 8: 2[illegible] "I speak that which I have seen with my Father. John 8: 38. "I proceeded forth, and came from God." John 8: 42.

In answer, therefore, to the question, "Hast thou seen Abraham?" our Lord could have replied, and which would have been consistent with these professions that he had seen Abraham in the mansions above, did Abraham, as a disembodied spirit, dwell there. But instead of this our Lord made answer, "Verily, verily I say unto you you, *before Abraham was* I am." John 8: 58. He frames his memorable reply in allusion to the distant period before Abraham existed, and explains thus how he had seen their illustrious Patriarch, "*Before* Abraham *was*"—obviously

"GEMELLA SLEEPS IN PEACE."
"HERE IS GORDIANUS, DEPUTY OF GAUL."

One Placus thus memorializes his wife Albana—

"YOU, WELL DESERVING ONE, HAVING LEFT YOUR [RELATIONS,] LIE IN PEACE—IN SLEEP—YOU WILL ARISE—A TEMPORARY REST IS GRANTED YOU."
"LAUNUS, THE MARTYR TO CHRIST, RESTS HERE."

One is buried with the prayer that she may "live in the Lord Jesus;" of another it is said he "sleeps in Christ."

"The Church in the Catacombs; a Description of the Primitive Church of Rome, Illustrated by its Sepulchral Remains, by Charles Maitland, M. D.," London: Longman & Co., 1846.

All these epitaphs speak not of a part—the body only being under the temporary power of death—but of the individual himself or herself. The grave is the temporary resting place of the human personality. Yes! only *temporary*, for Christ has said, "*The gates of Hades shall not* PREVAIL *against my Church.*"

before Abraham lived a man on this earth—"I am"—I, the self-existent being lived; and, therefore, although as a man I am "not yet fifty years old," I have seen your father Abraham in the days of his pilgrimage. Not a word is breathed that Christ had seen him in any other way than this. Our Lord speaks of Abraham not as a person *then* in existence, but as *having been*, and at that time *no more*. "Before Abraham *was*, I am." If Abraham, according to the opinions of many, is in heaven as a disembodied soul, it is marvellous that our Lord should go back to the distant antiquity of the Patriarch's earthly existence, to prove that he had seen him, when on this supposition he must have seen him in heaven, for he said, "I came down from heaven," and he spake of himself as "the Son of man who is in heaven." John 3: 13; 1: 18.

I would ask very special attention to that part of the Evangelical history which records the interview of our Lord with the Sadducees. Luke 20. This sect was evidently one of very great consideration among the Jews, since, notwithstanding the very serious errors which they professed, they were sufficiently numerous and influential to share the dignities of office with their rival countrymen the Pharisees. With both these sects Christ was at issue; and, therefore, his opposition to the one is not to be regarded as identifying him with the other. The Sadducees were very prominently opposed by the teaching of Christ, the grand theme of whose ministry was resurrection from the dead, a doctrine which this sect especially repudiated. The success of our Lord's mission as a teacher was, therefore, so much loss of influence to them: and in this respect, so much clear gain to that of the Pharisees. Under these circumstances they adventured to publicly confront him, and imagined that they should successfully perplex him, by instancing, what they supposed, an insuperable difficulty in the way of the doctrine in question.

It is not undeserving our notice that no allusion is made by the Sadducees to a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, to which their objection would also have been applicable; but they proceed from the time of the *death* of the woman of seven husbands to that of the *resurrection*. It would seem that, if our Lord had taught the doctrine of the conscious disembodied soul existing in a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, these philosophico-religious controvertists would scarcely have travelled over *this long interval* to a future event; it would have been more to their purpose to have inquired, "What relation does this woman sustain to her seven husbands *now?*" There would have been no greater absurdity in this question than that which they proposed, since, if it be affirmed that the soul is the human personality, capable of a separate existence, then relationships of some kind might be presumed to obtain in the intermediate state as likely as in the resurrection. It would have answered their end equally well to have asked the general question, "*What relation* does she *now* sustain to these husbands?" as the more specific one, "Whose *wife* will she be in the resurrection?" This form of the question, indeed, would have been the more useful, because it would have embraced the *two* obnoxious articles of the Pharisaic creed, and like a two-edged sword have cut both ways at once. The Sadducees not only denied the resurrection, but the Pharisaic philosophy of the existence of separate souls. Their silence with respect to this subject of disembodied existence in an intermediate state, makes it highly probable that whatever the Pharisees may have taught, Christ's ministry comprehended no such doctrine. Their inquiry is only in reference to the resurrection—they ask, "Therefore *in the resurrection* whose wife of them is she?"

And Christ's reply, although it does not formally contradict the popular doctrine of the conscious intermediate state, yet certainly seems to imply that there is no such state. "The children of this world," he says, "marry and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke 20:.34. Here are but two states spoken of—"the children of *this world*," and "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that world*." Not the remotest allusion is made to any *other* state in which man exists. On the contrary, it is affirmed of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *neither can they die any more*." It might be plausibly replied that our Lord used this word "*die*" in allusion to the *event* of death, the mere experience of dying; but it seems more natural and more in harmony with the context to suppose that he meant by it the *state* of death, the *whole period between* dying to "this world," and arising in "that world" of which he had previously been speaking. And the very phrases by which the redeemed are designated, seem to exclude any intermediate state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection. They are called in reference to their *two* states, "the children of this world," and "the children of the resurrection."*

But further, having exhibited to them the futility of their supposed unanswerable argument against the doctrine in question, and placed its possibility before them by the announcement that the new condition of the future life will dispense with many of the relations and circumstances of the present, he proceeds to appeal to their sacred books, and their acknowledged authority, Moses, in vindication of the doctrine of resurrection from the dead. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." Luke 20: 37–38. This allusion to the writings of Moses, let it be carefully observed, is for this especial purpose—to prove to the Sadducees the certainty of the resurrection. Its purpose is thus formally announced by Christ—"Now that the dead are (will be) raised." Obviously the *future*, according to a common idiom of language, is here put in the *present tense*. We inquire, how does this appeal to the words of Moses prove the disputed doctrine? Moses called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. But Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, are *dead!* Is God the God of the *dead?* Said Christ, "He is *not* a God of the *dead*, but of the *living;* for all live unto him." Does this last statement, "all live unto him," mean that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were *actually alive* as disembodied spirits? If so, how does it prove the point in debate? Christ is arguing with the object of proving the certainty of the resurrection—"Now that the dead are raised," is the position which he

* I avail myself of this opportunity of recommending to the reader the following pamphlet by the Rev. Edward White, entitled, "Who will live for ever?" A reply to the Rev. J. Howard Hinton's ingenuous, but, as I humbly conceive, most fallacious criticism on Luke 20: 36. The tractate by Mr. Hinton is entitled, "Who will live for ever? An examination of Luke 20: 36."

undertakes to prove. Such an interpretation of his words makes our Lord's argument *pointless;* it then contains no *proof* "that the dead are raised." But the argument is logical, and the proof triumphant. As if our Lord had said, True, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob *are dead,* but their death is only *temporary,* they will *live again;* this brief cessation of their existence is nothing to Him "who calls those things which be not as though they were." All live unto God, whom He designs *shall* live, though they live not *now.* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, although dead, yet live in God's affections and purposes; and at the appointed time, when "*all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth"—they shall live in His actual presence. God would not be called "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob," were they dead for ever, as you Sadducees believe; "for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Jesus Christ, as "the Resurrection and the Life" promised, and the Patriarchs are interested in that promise—"Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *not die for ever;*"* he shall die for a time, but not for ever; he shall rise again. Because, therefore, the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, will live again at the resurrection of the just, God, the "God of the living," is appropriately called by Moses their God. The proof of resurrection from the dead is complete and irresistible. The point to be proved, "Now that the dead are raised," is triumphantly reached. "Then certain of the Scribes answering said; Master, thou hast well said." Luke 20: 39.

This grand argument, however, involves much more than is at first apparent. It affirms, by implication, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are *dead;* that they are *not now* in possession of conscious life. Our Lord's argument demands this supposition; it is an essential step upon which he rises to his consummate proof of the resurrection of the dead. Where, then, is the Great Teacher's recognition of the doctrine of the disembodied spirit, and the intermediate state of consciousness of the dead? This one instruction, the more valuable on account of its argumentative form, and proceeding from him who has "the keys of hades and of death," is sufficient alone to scare away the human traditions against which we contend.

But this is not all. We have ascertained from the preceding argument, that Abraham is dead; in the plain common sense signification of *being out of existence,* as indeed said the Jews in their impertinent interrogation of our Lord—"Art thou greater than our father Abraham which is dead? And the prophets are dead; whom makest thou thyself?" I invite the reader to pay special attention to this. Christ in his reply to, and confutation of the Sadducees, taught by implication that *Abraham is dead.* Carry this instruction then to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and let our Lord be his own interpreter of that much perverted discourse. In that discourse—in the incongruous circumstances which are designedly gathered together to prevent misconception—there is sufficient evidence for the satisfaction of any candid mind, that our Lord was not revealing a *historic fact,* but delivering a parabolic instruction which could not be illustrated by a historic fact; the peculiar and complicated nature of the instruction necessary to be conveyed making that an impossibility.† The strenuous advocates of the dogmas of eternal torment, and the intermediate state of disembodied consciousness, must appeal to some other evidence of these unscriptural notions than to *Dives in torment;* for if Abraham is dead, that is, has *no conscious existence,* as our Lord most distinctly teaches, then Dives may be dead too, nay, *must be dead,* since there is no intermediate state of consciousness between death and the resurrection. Abraham who is one of the principal *dramatis personæ* in that parabolic discourse, has had no conscious existence since the moment of his death. If, therefore, it were not at variance with our Lord's method of teaching, to represent the *deceased Abraham* as a *living actor* in this parable, neither can it be to introduce a *deceased worldling,* and to represent him suffering torment* for the follies and wickedness of a misspent life. There was no danger, it would appear, that those whom our Lord addressed should mistake this obvious apologue for an actual fact. The doctrines of disembodied human personality and life in death, were as *novel* to them of the *first,* as they are *vital* to the orthodox of the *nineteenth* century.† If the parable be in danger of misleading

*John 11: 26. In the Greek it is not as in our English version, "shall never die," but "shall not die *for ever*"—*ou mee apothanee eis ton aiona.*

†See "Life and Death," Lect. III.

*The popular inference that the suffering of the wicked will be of *eternal* duration because Dives is represented suffering torment is most preposterous. The parable has simply the following—"And in hades he lifted up his eyes, *being in torments.*" Luke 16: 23. Nothing is here said about *eternal* torments! If it be replied that his torments must be *eternal* because his *soul is immortal,* my rejoinder is that he is not represented suffering as a *disembodied soul,* but in *his mortal and perishable body.* To fit him for eternal torture, his *corruptible* body must become *incorruptible;* and his *mortal* body must become *immortal.* But it is written—"*When* this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory.* 1 Cor. 15: 54. His very *qualification* for suffering would be the *signal* of his release! His body cannot suffer *eternally,* unless it be made *incorruptible* and *immortal.* But incorruptibility and immortality are the peculiar privileges of the regenerate!

†While making this remark, I do not forget that the Pharisees professed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. But this tenet was, I apprehend, rather an esoteric opinion of the sect, and confined more particularly to the learned. The peculiarty for which as a sect they were specially distinguished, was their maintenance, in opposition to the Sadducees, of the doctrine of resurrection of the dead. Admitting, however, that the Pharisees gave some prominence to the doctrine of the soul's immortality in their public teaching, and that such passages as Acts 23: 8–9, in which the word "spirit" occurs, is to be understood (which is very questionable) of the disembodied human spirit, this will only serve to explain the suitableness of our Lord's reprehension of their theological opinions, in common with those of the Sadducees, as when he said to his disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of *the Pharisees* and of the Sadducees. * * Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of *the doctrine of the Pharisees* and of the Sadducees." Matt. 16: 6–12. "If it be objected," says Mr. White, "that a more abstract and decided refutation of the Pharisaical tenet might have been anticipated from Jesus, had it been untrue, we reply, that he could not teach in the language of our metaphysics; and that the absence of the doctrine of human immortality from his discourses, viewed in connexion with the declaration above, affords all the satisfaction that can be reasonably desired.—"*Life in Christ,*" *Discourse II. p.* 123.

A writer in Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, thus accounts for the rise and formation of opinions of the sect of the Pharisees: "There is good reason to refer the origin of the Pharisees to the time of the return from the Babylonish Captivity, a period which constitutes a marked epoch, as dividing the Hebraim of the older and purer age from the Judaism of the latter and more corrupt times. * * * In Persia, the scattered Jews were subjected to *new and impure currents of opinion,* which would do something to overflow and overlay the primitive doctrines and usages. Here, then, was at once a soil for sectism. Puritans would spring up, wishing to preserve or restore the original form of doctrine and worship. They naturally called forth defenders of things as they were. But in the disputes which would hence arise, *appeal must be made to reason;* for the voice of prophecy was extinct, the divine oracles were silent; there remained only the Scriptures and the interpretation of them by means of tradition—a questioned instrument—and reason to which all were, in the nature of the case, compelled to appeal. *But when there is a general appeal to reason in religious questions, then philosophy is born in the Church,* and may be expected to take the several directions into which the diversities of formation and complexion urge the mind of man to run. Accordingly, it is

now, it is because we have as "doctrines the commandments of men." It is not that the teaching is ambiguous, but the mind receiving it is pre-occupied with a distracting and vain philosophy.

The conversation between Christ and the malefactor on the cross, is an historic incident commonly referred to in defence of the popular belief concerning the disembodied intermediate state, because our Lord promised the penitent suppliant that he should *be that day with him in Paradise.* A promise like this, the meaning of which is unquestionably somewhat ambiguous on account of our ignorance of the precise idea to be attached to the word *paradise,* ought never to be advanced in objection against other plain and unmistakable passages of Holy Writ; but, on the contrary, ought to receive its elucidation from the clearer light reflected by them. And, I think, I ought not to be chargeable with uncharitableness, when I state that the usual prominency given to these dubious portions of the sacred writings in defence of popularly received doctrines looks, to say the least, very suspicious, when the fair rendering of other and more explicit portions strongly disprove the hacknied interpretation of the popular creed. The word *paradise,* adopted by the Hebrews and Greeks, from the languages of Eastern Asia, simply signifies, if we are to allow its Armenian origin, a place for the cultivation of useful grains and edible herbs. It is of common occurrence in the Armenian language, and is used to denote a garden attached to a dwelling supplied with herbs and flowers for use and ornament.* The word *paradise* obtained a metaphoric signification, and was commonly used to denote any place or condition of exquisite delight and happiness. Hence, naturally it would come to denote the highest condition of happiness, the future state of the righteous. It thrice occurs in the New Testament writings, inclusive of the passage now under consideration. 2 Cor. 2: 4; Rev. 2: 7. But, because it is unquestionably employed in reference to the future state of the righteous, it would be an illogical conclusion to affirm that *that* is its *universal* and *exclusive employment.* This word occurs frequently in the Apocryphal writings, and in Josephus, signifying a *garden;* and sometimes as a metaphor, expressive of a subjective state of peculiar satisfaction and enjoyment. In its modern usage, also, it is constantly applied to any spot eminent for the picturesque, or to whatever contributes to excite emotions of a refined and pleasurable nature. Its employment, therefore, in one place, is no rule for its interpretation in another. Because it may signify the abode or the state of the blessed, it does not follow that it must *always have this meaning and no other.* The question is, what is its meaning *in the passage before us?* Does it *here* mean the mansions of the blessed *above,* or the abodes of the blessed *beneath?* Are we to understand by it, *in this place,* the heaven of conscious delight—the future apportionment of the righteous; or the grave of unconsciousness and silence, their intermediate dwelling place—the *hades* of the *blessed dead?* Would its application in this latter sense be inappropriate and absurd! We think not; for it is written of the "dead in Christ" that their state is *blessed—paradisiacal.* "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14: 13. When our Lord, therefore, replied to the dying malefactor, "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise," I conclude that he did not mean to assure him that *that day* he would go to the place of conscious blessedness, but he should "go to *his own* place"—that place which Christ presides over as "head over all things to his Church," and holder of "the keys of hades and of death;"—wherein, as it were, in one vast dormitory, repose the "dead in Christ," of whom it is promised they "shall rise first;" and concerning whom it is proclaimed, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." Rev. 20: 6. Surely that is a paradise! These "trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord," may, during this brief interval, be stripped of their rich foliage, and appear as if sealed in the barrenness of an endless death; but they await "the rising of the sun of righteousness" with "healing in his wings," to develop and mature their hidden life—they await the Lord's coming to transport them to a fitter, a heavenly soil. It is the *winter season* of paradise—the summer is to come; but whether winter or summer, it is nevertheless Paradise—"This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

But let us examine this promise more minutely. "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise." The favored man, then, was to be *that day with Christ.* Now, where was Christ *that day?*—because, *wherever* Christ was *that day, that* was *paradise.* Paul reminds the Corinthians as follows—"For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that *he was buried,* and that he rose again the third day." 1 Cor. 15: 3–4. Here the Apostle says that *Christ, not* the *body* of Christ, *died* and was *buried;* and that "*he*"—not the unconscious body, for that is not "*he*"—the *personality* Jesus—that "*he* rose again the third day" from the dead. *Until the third day,* therefore, according to Paul, Jesus was among the *buried dead.* The paradise, therefore, of which our Lord spoke, and in which he and the malefactor were to be that day, was not, it appears, inappropriately denominated *paradise,* although it was the condition of the *unconscious dead.*

Our Lord, also, had previously informed the sign-seeking Jews, that he would give them no other sign than that of the prophet Jonas; but that "as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the *Son of man* be three days and three nights in *the heart of the earth.*" The language of Christ here is very explicit: he declared that for *three days and three nights,* he, the Son of man—*not* his material body, but *he,* the compound being—the Son of man, would be during that time "in the heart of the earth"—the grave. Therefore, since our Lord was *that day* in the earth or grave, and the malefactor was to be *with him,* he must have been in the grave also. But he was to be *that day with our Lord in paradise.* The state, therefore, of the *buried dead* who "die in the Lord," is by our Lord here denominated *paradise.*

That the paradise in which our Lord had been during these three days was the state of the buried and unconscious dead, which he has converted for his people into a paradise, and that he had not during this interval passed into the heavenly mansions and the presence of his Father, is further evident

the name *philosophy* which Josephus gives to the three leading sects—'the Jews had three sects of philosophy.'—*Antiq.* 18: 1-2; *De Bell. Jud.* 2. 12. This philosophical tendency would, in process of time, be strengthened by the influence of the Western world, whose philosophy was cultivated and spread in the East, and particularly in Alexandria."—*Art. Pharisees.*

The foregoing account of the sect of the Pharisees, taken in connexion with our Lord's condemnation of their doctrinal teaching, will demonstrate the worthlessness of any appeal to *their* religious opinions in support of the popular creed in our own day.

*"Kitto's Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.," art. Paradise.

from his discourse with Mary Magdalene at the sepulchre. This devoted woman, in the ecstasy of discovering her Lord by his familiar tone of address, when he called her by name, as he was wont, fell down in pious homage to embrace the feet which she had washed with her tears and wiped with the hair of her head. The risen Lord declined, at that time, the expressions of her tenderness and reverence; and, since duty pointed another way, he bade her, "Touch me not, for *I am not yet ascended to my Father.*"* He, the "Son of man," had *not yet ascended* to his Father—he had not ascended to the *paradise above*. Thus we have two distinct affirmations by our Lord himself; first, that *that day* he would be "in the heart of the earth," or buried; and secondly, that *after three days* he had "not yet ascended" to his Father. The paradise, therefore, which our Lord promised the dying man *that day*, was not the paradise into which Paul, in vision, was "caught up," but the paradise of the *blessed dead*.

This interesting incident is capable of yet further elucidation, and which will confirm the foregoing observations. The promise, "this day thou shalt be with me in paradise," is the gracious answer returned by our Lord to the malefactor's request—"Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." We should, of course, expect that there would be some *congruity* between the request and the ready response which it met with. Now the request is, that Christ should remember this man on that great future occasion—"the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts 3: 21. It is not, "Lord, remember me when thou *goest*," but "when thou *comest* into thy kingdom." This man looked forward to the *second advent* of Christ, when he should come to sit upon the throne of David, to order and establish it, and when should take place the "first resurrection" of the saints. He begs, therefore, that the Lord will *remember him then*, and permit him to share in the honors of "the manifestation of the sons of God." Rom. 8: 19. It is to *this petition* that our Lord returns the gracious answer, "This day thou shalt be *with me* in paradise." As if Christ had said, "I will remember you when I come in my kingdom, for *this day* you shall be among those of whom it is written, 'blessed are the dead which die in (or with) the Lord'—concerning whom it is recorded, 'they sleep in Jesus,' (1 Thess. 4: 14,) by one of whom it is affirmed, that 'to depart and to be *with Christ* is far better,' (Phil. 1: 23,) and who are described as being 'buried with him in baptism,' and 'dead with Christ.'" Col. 2: 12–20. "We are buried with him, says Paul, by baptism into death * * * for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." Rom. 6: 4, 5, 8. Thus, to be with Christ, as was promised to this dying malefactor, is to be "dead with Christ," and to be "buried with him;" because they who are "dead with him" and "buried with him," shall also "live with him" and "reign with him."† And this surely is Paradise! The promise to the converted malefactor, so far from supporting the popular dogma of the intermediate state of disembodied consciousness of the dead, takes its rank in the file of general Scripture testimony, in opposition to a notion so absurd and mischievous.

To what has already been advanced, I will select, under this section, but one more testimony in confutation of the popular theory concerning the separate and conscious state of the soul in death. When Christ appeared in the vision to John, in Patmos, he thus addressed him, "I am he that *liveth* and was *dead*, and behold I am *alive* for evermore." Rev. 1: 18. In this declaration we have the contrast of two states—*life* and *death* in the experience of our Lord. "I am he that *liveth*," is opposed to I am he that "*was dead*." The opposite, then, of *life*, or a state of consciousness, is *death*, or a state of unconsciousness. If death means, as is popularly believed, the disintegration of certain distinct and separate parts of man, and that the conscious being—the thinking, knowing part—survives this disintegration intact—then, where, I ask, is the contrast to the being *alive*, of which our Lord in this text speaks? It is obvious that there is no contrast whatever, and it might, with as much reason, have been written, "I am he that liveth, and *has never* died;" for if the *spirit*, which is said to be the human personality, survives death and lives on, then man never dies—with reference to him, there is no such thing as death. But, said our Lord, "I am he that *liveth* and *was dead*, and behold I am alive for evermore," language which certainly affirms that Christ, as "the Son of Man," had once ceased to exist.

The Scriptures teach nothing, philosophically, about the composition of the human nature, and it is certainly very great presumption to profess a perfect knowledge of that, which in its nature is beyond the circle of human science, and concerning which revelation has communicated absolutely nothing. So far from furnishing man with any means for the analysis of his own nature, and the state into which he passes in death, Jehovah appeals to our necessary ignorance of these matters. "Thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit." Ecc. 11: 5. "Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? Or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?" Job 38: 17. Modern theology professes to know both "the way of the spirit," and to have penetrated into the region of "the shadow of death." It has affirmed of the spirit, that it is a distinct principle, independent of the corporeal part of man, possessed of consciousness and immortality; and with no less confidence it has pronounced *how much* of man is the prey of death, and *how much* is beyond the power of death! And these *ex cathedra* dogmas it has enrolled among the credenda of orthodox doctrines, and after a venerable example, has added the terrible imprecation, *Si quis non dixerit, anathema sit.*

Were this all that this adding to God's Word had done, it were comparatively trifling; but the revealed

*John 20: 17. *Oupo anabebeeka* literally, as the past tense' "I *have not* yet ascended." *Baino*, in the same tense, compounded with *meta*, occurs in John 5: 24, *metabebeeken*, English version, "is passed," literally, "*has* passed."

†It is not uncommonly objected, that to lie in the grave from the time of death to the resurrection, is a cold and repulsive view of the state of the dead. Death, itself, is ever repulsive, under whatsoever form it may be presented. Witness Christ groaning in spirit, and being "troubled," as he followed the weeping sisters of Lazarus to the grave of their brother; and which was repeated when he reached the sepulchre of the dead. Witness that wonderful scene of sorrow, in Gethsemane, when the loving Redeemer, who came to drink the cup of woe for man, exclaimed, in the agony of its anticipation, "if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" The Apostle Paul refers to the Saviour's shrinking from death, when he says, "Who—[namely, Christ,]—in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to *save him from death*." Heb. 5: 7. It may be thought a comfortless doctrine which we proclaim, but we cannot convert into a blessing what God has denominated *a curse*. It is this that makes redemption, by means of resurrection, so great a boon, because sin and its fruit, death, are such dreadful evils. The wise will ask for truth, be it ever so unpalatable.

Word is perfect in all its parts—"the law of the Lord is perfect," and to add to it, is to disturb its harmonies, and render nugatory and inefficient much that the edification and health of the Church demand. By casting into this perfect work of the Divine Spirit a foreign element, mankind have destroyed its admirable balance—distracted, confused, and in some important respects, obliterated the truth as it is in Jesus. Much wiser and happier had man been, if, in reference to this subject, he had been content with his necessary ignorance, and been humble enough to confess, "such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it;"—and had assumed the devout, rather than the presumptuous attitude upon the extreme circumference of human knowledge, exclaiming, with the Psalmist, "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made."

SECTION VI.—THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE DEAD.

Hitherto we have seen that the testimony of Scripture is univocal on the subject of human mortality. We find nowhere inculcated in the Bible such doctrines as that the disembodied soul is the human personality, and a state of consciousness intermediate between death and the resurrection. The discourses of our Lord, so far from maintaining these mischievous theories, contain the most complete refutation of them. Enough has already been adduced to convince any candid inquirer of the error of the popular teaching on these topics. Since, however, certain passages in the epistolary writings of the New Testament are alleged in vindication of these opinions, I shall proceed to show what is the *Apostolic testimony* concerning them.

There are passages in the Apostolic writings which, although they might be made to comport with the popular theories, are yet more natural and significant on the supposition that the Apostles believed in a total cessation of consciousness immediately upon death. Such are the following—"I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord * * * that I may know him, and the *power of his resurrection*, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 8, 10–11, "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God (by resurrection.) For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered *from the bondage of corruption* into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, and not only they but ourselves also which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body*." Rom. 8: 18–23.

In the foregoing citations, the resurrection from the dead is obviously the great theme. "The manifestation of the sons of God," by deliverance "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," is alluded to as the grand consummation in the history of the Church of Christ. Paul expresses his hope in language which I hesitate not to say is inconsistent with the idea that the *mere body* is the subject of resurrection. The future life, he evidently considered, remained veiled until the graves should be opened, and the dead should come forth from them. No resurrection, no future life was clearly Paul's doctrine, as we shall have occasion presently to acknowledge, if it be not sufficiently implied in the strongly impassioned exclamation, "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead!" In common with other believers, he says, we "groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." His language is that of the intensest ardor and aspiration, the object of which is "resurrection"—"redemption of the body." Not a syllable is uttered about attaining to *disembodied felicity*; his fervor is not kindled by any expectation that death would introduce him a bodiless *spirit* to the presence he loved! Why this silence about the soul?—this total disregard of its immediate blessedness subsequent to forsaking its gross and corruptible companion? Is it then more *apostolic* to "groan" for the "redemption of the body" than to rejoice in the emancipation and beatitude of the soul? There is no avoiding the acknowledgment, that Paul and the faithful who had "the first fruits of the spirit," are, in this passage, engrossed with the one exclusive theme—resurrection from the dead. This is inexplicable according to the theory of the orthodox faith; but it accords naturally with the doctrinal instructions of the Apostle; for "if there be no resurrection of the dead," he says, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." 1 Cor. 15: 13–14. Compare this unmistakable enthusiasm of Paul with the fervid aspirations of modern piety:

"There is a house not made with hands,
Eternal and on high;
And here my *spirit, waiting stands*,
Till God *shall bid it fly*.
* * * * * * *
Prepare me, Lord, for thy right hand,
Then come the joyful day;
Come death and some celestial band
To bear my soul away.
* * * * * * *
Haste, my beloved, *fetch my soul*
Up to thy blessed abode;
Fly, for *my spirit longs to see*
My Saviour and my God.
* * * * * * *
There shall I bathe *my weary soul*
In seas of heavenly rest:
And not a wave of trouble roll
Across my peaceful breast!"

This pious breathing, notwithstanding its poetic charms and endeared associations, is most strikingly discrepant with the aspirations of Apostles and contemporary believers. How shall we explain the phenomenon that the first Christians, headed by their inspired teachers, were engrossed with the thought of a redeemed body and a future resurrection, as the *first* and *immediate object* of their personal hope; while Christians in our day are yearning for disembodied bliss, uttering in their accredited psalmody—

"Death like a narrow sea divides
This heavenly land from ours;"

and, forgetful of the body and the future resurrection, would fain

"Sit and sing themselves away
To everlasting bliss!"

It is quite true, that "redemption of the body" and "resurrection of the dead," hold a place in the modern Christian creed; but they evidently hold not *the place* which they occupied in the creed of the first believers. Let the reader peruse the sacred writings with an eye to the position which the Christian doctrine of resurrection occupies in the teaching and estimation of the primitive Church, and then appeal

to his own experience of the position which it occupies in the Evangelical pulpits of his own day, and he will be constrained to acknowledge that what was urged forward in former times—the best and purest times—into the very van of Christian doctrine is now scarcely to be found even in the rear. Resurrection from the dead in the Apostle's days, was taught for the comfort and hope of the Church: the same doctrine, whenever it is brought forward now, is rather alluded to as a *subordinate* fact in the history of redemption; seldom, if ever referred to as the converging point of the most cherished desires and hopes of the believer in Christ.

To these observations I know it may be replied, that whatever specialty may distinguish the doctrine of the redemption of the body at resurrection in the citations above, there are, notwithstanding, in the same Apostle's writings, particular and evident allusions to a participation in the blessedness of heaven immediately consequent upon death; and, therefore, the soul must be capable of existing in a disembodied state, and retain in itself the conscious personality of the human being. The passages alluded to are the following—

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain * * * * I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ which is far better." Phil. 1: 21–23.

It is always assumed that the first part of this citation is to be understood as if it were written "for to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain *to me*," and such may possibly be its meaning. But it stands in close connection with the foregoing magnanimous resolution of the Apostle—"In nothing I shall be ashamed, but with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death, for to me to live is Christ and to die is gain." The resolution of Paul is, that Christ shall be magnified by him either way, whether he live or die; if he *live*, it shall be *for Christ*, and if he *die*, it shall be *for Christ*, and thus Christ shall be gainer by his life or death. The meaning, therefore, may be thus expressed, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain"—that is, to Christ. But allowing that the generally received exposition is correct, that the gain is *not Christ's*, but the Apostle's, I would ask if this general expression, "to die is gain," must necessarily mean, that at death the Apostle would enter, as a disembodied soul, into a state of conscious bliss? Were we ignorant of such a doctrine as this, of the separate state of the soul as the conscious personality, should we be likely to learn it, for the first time, from the texts before us? Surely not! With this belief in the mind, it is not unnatural to attach to these texts such a signification as is popularly claimed for them; but without such previous belief, he would be considered a most extravagant teacher, and they most credulous disciples, who should appeal to these passages in vindication of such doctrines. If the reader will recall to memory Paul's astonishing description of his apostolic life and labors, he will find no difficulty in apprehending his meaning when he says, "to die is *gain*," and adds, "for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a *desire to depart* and to be with Christ which is *far better*."

It is objected that the Apostle could not call a state of unconsciousness "gain"—that he could not "desire to depart" in this sense, and consider a state of dormancy "far better." Surely life on earth, a life, too, like the Apostle's, full of efficient labors, must, to a mind like his, have been preferable to such a death.

Paul was not insensible to the honors of his apostolic life, nor indifferent to the glory of his Lord; but Paul was a *man*, and, like other men, possessed of human instincts and sensibilities, which permitted no stoicism in the painful experience of thorns in the flesh, and "messengers of Satan sent to buffet him." He loved his work; but *his* work was associated with great affliction, and he could say, from experience, "No affliction for the present is joyous, but grievous." It was because he loved his work, but suffered greatly in the prosecution of it, that he said, "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain * * * for *I am in a strait betwixt two*." He sighed to enter into *rest*, but he loved to serve his Lord and the Church; and his wonderful devotion to his Master's service induced him to decide, if it pleased his Lord, "to abide in the flesh." "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better; nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

Let those who would chide the Apostle, if they thought that the above was the correct exposition of his meaning—that is, that he desired to enter upon the state of unconscious repose—put themselves in his position, and with all their moral magnanimity, for which we give them the fullest credit, we question much, if *they* would even be "in a strait betwixt two"—if *they* would not think that, whatever might be "more needful" for others, it would be "more needful" and profitable, too, for *them* "to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." Surely that is not an unnatural, nor an unfaithful desire for him to express, who could say, "in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews, five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily—the care of all the churches." 2 Cor. 11: 23–28.

For an explanation of the phrase, to "depart *and be with* Christ," I refer to the remarks already made under the foregoing section. Surely no one will contend that the only way in which Paul could be "with Christ," is as a disembodied soul, in the conscious enjoyment of his presence! We have already seen that it is possible to be "dead with Christ," and to be "buried with Christ," and evidently, *in this*, and no other way, at death, did Paul expect to be "with Christ." He who never once taught others that they shall live with Christ, until "Christ, who is our life, shall appear," at his second advent, could not claim this privilege for himself. The intelligent and candid reader will, I think, justify my conclusion that the texts before us cannot fairly be pressed into the defence of the popular opinions; and that had such opinions never existed, the devout truth-seeker would never have imagined that they were inculcated here.

The following is another passage in the writings of Paul, upon which very considerable stress is laid by the advocates of the popular theory. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are *at home in the body*, we are *absent* from the Lord. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be *absent* from the body and to be *present* with the Lord."

2 Cor. 5: 6-8. It is readily allowed that this passage *seems* to teach the doctrine of the soul's separate state, and immediate felicity in that state. But this *apparent* instruction is to be attributed to the fact that such doctrines are so generally taught and accredited. Holding the traditional belief that the soul of man is his personality, and is capable of existing, independently of the body, it is natural to put such a construction upon this text as that which commonly obtains. But I cannot think that the believers in Corinth, who had read and understood the Apostle's first epistle, could have so interpreted his meaning. Such an interpretation would have been in direct contradiction to the very clear and cogent reasoning contained in the 15th chapter of their first epistle. Let the text under consideration be taken, not as is generally the practice, *apart from*, but in *connection with*, its context. The chapter contains, in its first half, a profession of the believer's faith in his survivance of his mortality. The imagery—for the language is obviously figurative—is that of an "earthly house of this tabernacle," which is condemned to be "dissolved," and which was the Apostle's appropriate image to describe the mortality of the creature man. Man, the one compound being, is compared to an "earthly house" or "tabernacle," which will be "dissolved." Nothing is here said nor implied about an immortal and essentially *permanent* part of man, which, in its own nature, is independent of this general and complete dissolution, which is most unaccountable, as on the popular supposition this immortal part is the human personality. The believer is here taught that *he himself*, in his one totality, *not a part* of himself, must be "dissolved." But he knows that if *like* an "earthly house," he must crumble in dissolution, he will be restored again in the beauty and durability of a "building of God, a house not made with hands," and which is impressed with the mortality of its builder; but one that is "eternal in the heavens." Here the two states of the believer's existence are described by an "earthly house" or "tabernacle," which must dissolve, and "a building of God, a house eternal in the heavens." Paul is undoubtedly speaking of the *two bodies* to which he alludes in the 15th chapter of his first epistle—"there is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body*;" and hence he says, in the second verse, "for in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven. For we that are in this tabernacle—[dwelling as mortal creatures]—do groan, being burdened, *not for that we would be unclothed*—[we desire not to die]—but clothed upon—[with our eternal house from heaven]—that *mortality may be swallowed up of life.*" "Therefore, we are always confident;" for we know that if, on the one hand, as mortal beings we must dissolve in death—on the other hand, as beings upon whom God has conferred for Christ's sake and through him, the gift of immortality, we shall, when we are raised from the dead and receive our spiritual natures, live again as immortal beings "eternal in the heavens." "We are always confident" of this, and know "that whilst we are at home in the body"—whilst, that is, we are existing as earthly tabernacles, mortal and perishable, "we are absent from the Lord," with whom we cannot be until we have put off our mortality, and assume our immortality; which will be when we are raised from the dead in our "spiritual body," our "building of God," our "house" which is "eternal in the heavens." "We are confident," I say, of so glorious a re-creation in Christ Jesus awaiting us; and are, therefore, "willing rather to be absent from the body," that is, from our "natural body"—our present mortal and corruptible nature which separates us from the Lord—and to be possessed of our "spiritual body," our incorruptible nature, in order 'that we may be present with the Lord," which cannot be until the resurrection, when "mortality shall be swallowed up of life."

The Apostle desired to *be* present with the Lord, not as a disembodied soul, for he says, *not* for that we would be unclothed; and hence, in harmony with this desire, he says, "in this we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven;" and, therefore, since this "clothing upon" or re-creation of the human nature cannot take place until the resurrection, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality"—his desire to "be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" cannot be gratified, and he evidently did not expect it from his reasoning, until the dead in Christ shall rise in "the first resurrection."

So far then from inculcating the doctrine, that at death the *soul* of the believer is present with the Lord, this text forms part of an important passage in the Apostle's writings in which he exhibits an utter disregard of such a doctrine, and declares that his own *earnest longing was for the day of resurrection;* when, being "absent from the body"—having, that is, parted for ever with his mortality, he should possess his new immortal nature, in which he should behold and be for ever "present with the Lord."

I leave then the teacher of the popular doctrine to explain this remarkable fact, that here, as in the two places which we have previously considered, the Apostle says nothing of the blissful interval between death and resurrection—expresses no desire in reference to this interval; but as if impatient of it, he *groans* and *earnestly desires* to be "clothed upon" with his "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The conclusion is unavoidable, that the Apostle Paul knew no such state of intermediate blessedness for the soul; the consummation of his wishes is thus expressed—"If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 11.

Some, in their determination not to yield this, the citadel of their favorite dogma, endeavor to make something plausible of it by what is termed riding a metaphor to death. The figurative expressions, "clothed upon," and "at home in," and "absent from the body," it is alleged, must signify *something distinct* from the *clothing* and the *body*. That which is "clothed upon,"* and which is "at home in or

*Many expositors unduly exaggerate this and similar figurative expressions of Scripture. The imagery of *clothing* was one of the most common and familiar to the Hebrew writers. It simply signifies being influenced by, or becoming possessed of, anything without any reference to the *manner* of the influence or possession. In Peter's second Epistle, ch. 1: 13, the Apostle thus writes—"I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must *put off* this my tabernacle." On this passage the pious and learned Dr. Watts comments: "The soul or thinking principle of the Apostle Peter, which is here supposed to be himself, is so plainly distinguished from the tabernacle of the body, in which he dwelt for a season, and which he must *'put off'* shortly, that most evidently implies an existence of this thinking soul, very distinct from the body, and which will exist when the body is laid aside. Surely, the conscious being and its tabernacle or dwelling place, are two very distinct things; and the conscious being exists when he puts off his present dwelling."—"*Essay towards the Proof of a Separate State.*" Here is an example of forcing a meaning out of the *figurative terms* by which a truth is illustrated; a method of interpretation which, if cast in a canonical form, the eminent Doctor would not for one moment have allowed. In proof of the incorrectness of the Doctor's exposition of the above passage, let the reader endeavor to interpret on his principle the following kindred texts—"*Put ye on* the Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 13: 14. "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have *put on* Christ."

absent from the body," is the *immortal soul.* Now this looks very specious; but admit it for the sake of argument, and it is obvious what a strange and unmeaning confusion of language the whole of this part of the chapter exhibits. Paul sets out with expressing the strong confidence which he and believers generally had in their triumph over mortality when they should receive their "building of God," their "spiritual body," which he had shown in his first epistle, will be bestowed at the resurrection. Groaning under the burden of a present mortality, he earnestly desires that the time may soon arrive when, possessed of his "spiritual body," "mortality shall be swallowed up of life." *Until* this clothing upon—that is, until the resurrection—it is obvious that *mortality reigns*—it is *not* swallowed up of life." But how does this instruction of Paul's agree with the popular belief that the immortal soul at death escapes from its prison house of clay, and that at *this moment*—

> "There is a land of pure delight,
> Where saints immortal reign"?

The Apostle is evidently at variance with the modern theology on this point, when he teaches that *not until* we are "*created* in Jesus Christ"—invested with our "spiritual body"—"clothed upon" by our "building of God," the grand result is accomplished, *mortality is swallowed up of life.*

Besides, on the supposition that the being "absent from the body" and "present with the Lord," refers to the immortal soul leaving its corporeal abode and ascending to God, how, I ask, does this statement follow as an *inference* from what the Apostle had been previously discoursing upon? Why does he preface it by a term which shows that it stands connected with the foregoing observations as a consequence, and say, "*Therefore,* we are always confident," &c.?

The substance of Paul's statement is that he earnestly desired the *arrival of resurrection,* that he might be possessed of his spiritual and immortal nature. What logical connection is there between this emphatic desire, and the statement that, when he died, his disembodied soul ascended to the presence of God? According to the exposition given above, the connection is obvious and natural; but such an exposition of the passage, the only possible one as it appears to me, gives a most decided contradiction to the doctrine which is so fondly and furtively reared upon it.

But further, if we are to understand that apparent *something* which is clothed upon to be the spiritual nature or soul, then the Apostle plainly avows that he had *no desire for this intermediate state;* for he says, "Not for that we would be *unclothed.*" Even with this gloss his longing is for the "redemption of the body" at resurrection. Let it be noted, that according to this exposition, Paul does not pass over in silence the popular notion of an intermediate state of bliss, as in the true exposition of the passage as given above; he is made to affirm that he would rather not participate in it; he does not desire disembodied bliss—"Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

Once more, if it be affirmed that the imagery of being "clothed upon" represents the popular notion of the *soul* as *something within* which is "clothed upon" with its "earthly house" or "building of God," then consistency demands that the doctrine of the soul's incorruptibility and immortality be forthwith discarded from the orthodox belief; for it is written, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." 1 Cor. 15: 53. This *something within—the soul*—must put on incorruption and immortality, and is itself called "this corruptible, and this mortal." "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory"

The attempt to evade the proper meaning of the Apostle's language, does but involve the disconcerted polemic in greater perplexities, and in the end lead to his being entangled and taken in his own net. Candor must compel the acknowledgement that the very prevalent custom of quoting this text of Paul's for the purpose of teaching that he expected to be with Christ immediately at death, is most unwarrantable; a very gross and mischievous perversion of his meaning.

I now proceed to show, from other parts of the epistolary writings, that the doctrines of the disembodied and intermediate states, as popularly understood and received, were evidently unknown to the Apostles. They have made statements which no ingenuity, even though stimulated by the idolatry of system, can unblushingly explain away. I select from Paul's celebrated argument with certain sceptical Corinthians who said, "there is no resurrection of the dead," and which is contained in the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to that church·

"If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." 1 Cor. 15: 12.

Two consequences are here asserted to follow upon the denial of the resurrection of the dead. The first is, that Christ cannot have risen from the dead, and the second is, that the religion of Christ is a vain and profitless profession—"Our *preaching is vain,* and *your faith is also vain.*" Now, in this statement we learn what was the subject of apostolic preaching, and what was the faith of primitive saints. "Our preaching is vain," says the Apostle, "if Christ be not risen," which event has not occurred, "if there be no resurrection of the dead." Paul, therefore, preached a *risen Saviour,* and the *resurrection of the dead.* And thus his historian informs us, that on the occasion of his arraignment before the Jewish council, he exclaimed, "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: *of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.*" Acts 23: 6. Before the Roman Felix, he thus explains himself—"After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts 24: 14–15. And again, "Let these same here say, if they have found any evil-doing in me, while I stood before the council, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, *Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day.*" Acts 24: 20–21. The governor, Festus, thus explains to King Agrippa the nature of the accusation brought against Paul—"Against whom, when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed; but had certain questions

Gal. 3: 27. "Seeing that ye have *put off* the old man with his deeds, and have *put on* the new man." Col. 3: 9–10. "*Put on* therefore, * * bowels of mercies, &c. Col. 3: 12. "Put *on* Charity." Col. 3: 14. "He *put on* righteousness as a breast plate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; and he *put on* the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak." Isa. 49: 17.

against him, of their own superstition, and of *one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive.*" Acts 25: 18–19. In his address before Agrippa, Paul thus speaks, "And now I stand and am judged for *the hope of the promise* made of God unto our fathers—[evidently, the hope of the promise of resurrection]—unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Acts 26: 6–8. And near the conclusion of his apology, he says, "Having, therefore, obtained help of God, I continue unto this day witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come; that Christ should suffer, and *that he should be the first that should rise from the dead.*" Acts 26: 22–23. At Athens we are informed that his philosophical auditory said, "he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, because *he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection.* And they took him and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, may we know *what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?*" To which Paul replies, after certain prefatory observations, God "hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, we will hear thee again of this matter." Acts 17: 18–19, 31–32.

The above very forcibly explain what Paul meant, when he said, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, * * * then is our *preaching vain;*" because the resurrection of the dead was evidently the burden of the Apostle's ministry. On this physical fact depends that grand moral superstructure of the sanctified living temple, whose foundations are laid in this life, but whose development, as "the perfection of beauty," is contingent upon the life which is to come. And hence Paul further affirms, "*Your faith is also vain,* * * * if there be no resurrection of the dead," for then the great object of your solicitude—the means of your triumph over "this corruptible" and "this mortal," is an unreal and impossible event. That the resurrection from the dead was the great object of solicitude to the apostolic Church, let Paul's own experience testify. "If, by any means, I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead"—and his statement, we "which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves *groan* within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

The infidelity of those persons in the Corinthian Church, on the subject of resurrection, is shown by the Apostle to be most absurd. In taking away this doctrine, they deprived Christianity of its great turning point—they tore away from the Christian profession all hope and motive—they sealed up the vestibule of the temple of life. Allow that the resurrection will not occur, then Christianity is a meaningless profession—our "preaching" and your "faith" are both "vain."

But how could Paul declare this, if *the soul* of man, after death, will proceed at once, as *his disembodied personality*, either to happiness or to misery? Surely his "preaching" and their "faith" *could not be* "vain," if nothing more were accomplished but the purification and preparation of the soul for its bodiless bliss in the future life! But, both "preaching" and "faith" were "vain," if the utility of Christian doctrine, and the realization of believers' blessedness *depend* upon the resurrection of the dead, which event would never occur. And that resurrection *is thus vital* to Christianity, the Apostle's argument proves, or it is incoherent and worthless.

"If the dead rise not * * * then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15: 16–18.

The Apostle, in this concise piece of reasoning, distinctly affirms that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then there is no future life. He shows, also, what was *his* doctrine of the intermediate state of believers—"they which are fallen asleep in Christ," *not* they which are in a state of disembodied consciousness and activity in glory. But, can the orthodox of the nineteenth century agree with Paul in this affirmation, that if the dead rise not, Christians who have departed this life are *perished?* No, they say, "if the dead rise not," the *soul lives on*—its life does *not depend* upon the resumption of the body. Then what does Paul mean, when he says that "they which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished?*" How have they *perished?* Will it be replied that the body is only alluded to—that "if the dead rise not," the body will perish? If so, we have two objections to offer to such an interpretation. The first is, that the Apostle says, "then they which are fallen asleep in Christ." Surely Paul could not mean, by this expression, mere *dead bodies!* Dead bodies are not "they which are fallen asleep in Christ." The very expression is against such an interpretation, to say nothing of the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures, which certainly gives it no sanction.

Besides, such an exposition involves a departure from the *theological* sense of the word "perished." There are several important passages of Scripture in which the word "perish" occurs, and in reference to which we are told that we must understand this word in the *theological* sense, *not* in the natural and common sense, which unscholastic readers might dangerously adopt. Now, the *theological* sense of the word "perish" in those parts of the sacred writings to which allusion has been made, is an everlasting endurance of miserable suffering in the fires of Gehenna. Why, then, depart from this sense in the present instance? Let criticism and exegesis be consistent, and we have the following as the signification of the passage before us—"Then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished,*" that is, they have gone to Gehenna, to endure the endless torments of the unquenchable fire. This is the *theological* sense of *perishing!* I need not characterize such an interpretation as most awfully and insultingly absurd. What! the holy, self-denying followers of Christ, *because the dead rise not, a hope* which they had fondly cherished, to be consigned to endless misery! Paul never meant this. *He* was no professor of the cabalistic theology which disdains the vulgar expositions of plain sense. He might be unscholastic and untheologic according to modern ideas; he might not be skilled in the abnormal art of spiritualizing plain words; but he was a preacher, commissioned by Christ, and if his teaching was "not in the words, which man's wisdom teacheth," he could nevertheless say, "I speak forth the words of truth and soberness." I leave it with the teacher of the soul's separate and conscious existence, in the interval between death and resurrection, to account for the Apostle's statement, that "if the dead rise not, then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished.*"

"Else what shall they do which are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are

they then baptised for the dead?" 1 Corinth. 15: 29.

I am aware that this is a very disputed passage, and that many and conflicting expositions have been given of it. But I am of opinion that the plain common-sense reader, whose mind was devoutly intent upon the current reasoning of the Apostle in this chapter, would hardly pause to ask, what does Paul mean in this place? He would conclude that the meaning was something as follows: "Else what shall they do who have been baptised [into Christ] for [or in hope of the resurrection of] the dead;" what, I say, "shall they do if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptised for [professing their expectation of the resurrection of] the dead?" The phraseology in this place is peculiar, but it is in harmony with what the Apostle elsewhere employs, when he speaks of being baptised into Christ's death, and being buried with Christ by baptism into death. Rom. 6: 3-4.

Here, as in the foregoing extracts, the Apostle is intent upon resurrection of the dead. "What shall they do," he asks, "if the dead rise not at all?" I ask the candid reader if Paul could have asked such a question, if he believed in the modern dogma of disembodied felicity for the departed saints of Christ? Surely they could both "do" and enjoy much, if, as separate and immortal spirits, they departed at death to be with Christ.

"And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" 1 Cor. 15: 30.

This question is connected with the text last under consideration, "If the dead rise not at all, why are they then baptised for the dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" "We" who are the objects of such cruel and unremitted persecution, "we" who are in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils everywhere—"why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" Paul seems totally indifferent to anything like disembodied bliss, he sees no reward awaiting him in the interval between death and resurrection. "Why stand we in jeopardy," he asks, "every hour, if the dead rise not at all?"

"What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." 1 Cor. 15: 32.

Here is something like a climax. Paul in this passage unquestionably declares, that if the dead do not rise, then he expected no advantage beyond the present life; and the wisest course would be to gratify the sensual appetites, as that would be the greatest good which man can enjoy. *Then* there can be little doubt "a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry." Eccl. 8: 15. Therefore, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The path of virtue, notwithstanding its present benefits, is so difficult to persevere in, that the easiest way of enjoying life is to turn sensualist, for all will be one in the end—"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Again, I inquire, could Paul write in this strain if he believed that there is a state of retribution to which the disembodied soul of man is amenable immediately after death? Who that is a believer in the opinion of the soul's separate state and conscious life after death, will adopt the language of the holy Apostle and ask, "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not?" He cannot adopt such language. If the dead rise not, it does, nevertheless, greatly advantage him as a believer in the soul's immortality. He would deem it awful profanity to say at all, much more with the earnest enthusiasm with which Paul uttered the words, "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But surely it is not unsafe to follow an Apostle's example, or to adopt an Apostle's sentiment! Paul, in an earlier chapter of this epistle, thus addresses these Corinthians, "I beseech you be ye followers of *me:*" nor would he have rebuked the man who might have echoed his language. Paul, it must be admitted, taught most emphatically, that *if there be no resurrection from the dead, there is no future life.* There can be then no undying soul; and hence no intermediate state of enjoyment or suffering for man.

In his pastoral character, Paul exhibits the samo disregard of the doctrine of an intermediate state of life for the separate soul, as he had done in his character of the Christian dialectician. Thus he writes to the bereaved saints at Thessalonica—

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4: 13-18.

How unlike is this Apostolic mode of consoling the friends of the departed to that which obtains *now!* Paul calls the departed "them which are asleep"—"the dead in Christ," and he bids survivors "sorrow not even as others which have no hope" in resurrection unto life; because, since "Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him," when he comes to erect his throne and reign over the nations in righteousness; for "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and shall follow in the train of their victorious Lord. Be not, therefore, perplexed, says Paul, because I have taught you that some will be "alive and remain" upon the earth "unto the coming of the Lord," among whom will be ourselves if the Lord shall come in our life-time; be not, I say, perplexed by this statement, as if those "which are alive and remain" shall "prevent" (anticipate) the resurrection of "them which are asleep," among whom are your departed friends, whose memory you so fondly and naturally cherish. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first;" and so having raised them out of their graves he will "bring" them "with him" to meet us who may happen to be "alive and remain" at the time of that event; and we "shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

"These words," by which Paul would have the Thessalonian mourners comforted, contain no comforting assurances that their deceased friends were as never dying souls

"Drinking fresh draughts of endless pleasure in;"

but, that notwithstanding they were dead, this should not disconcert the survivors, as if the power of the Lord could not raise them again; "for," says the Apostle, "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will

God bring with him." The resurrection of Christ is the pledge of his people's resurrection—"Because I live ye shall live also." Therefore, "comfort one another with these words," that your now deceased friends shall live again, and together with you be glorified with your Lord. "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should *raise the dead?*" "Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures nor *the power of God.*"

Here, it will be granted, is a very suitable place for expecting some suggestions about disembodied bliss in the state between death and resurrection; but the Apostle pauses not in the *interval*—he draws thence no means of solace to the mourners, but tells them that their departed friends are indeed in the land of darkness and forgetfulness, and bids them look onward to resurrection as the period when they shall next live again. Paul tells this early Church of no meeting with their Lord until resurrection. "Then," namely, when "the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout"—"then," not before, "we shall be caught up together to *meet* the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Compare this mode of comforting mourners with the orthodox method in our day. Paul bade the sorrowing friends at Thessalonica think of opening graves at the resurrection; it is the orthodox exhortation to think of *emancipated spirits* entering into the joys of the upper paradise. Paul, it appears, had no means of consoling the mourners by any assurance of immediate blessedness for the departed faithful—he could only bid them look forward to the great gathering at the resurrection unto life. Modern Christian pastors have an advantage over Paul in this respect; *they* can anticipate and guarantee something of this prospective blessedness—*they* can tell the bereaved that their friends are in "glory," and ask—

> "Why do ye mourn departing friends,
> Or shake at death's alarms?
> 'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
> To call them to his arms.
>
> Behold th' innumerable host
> Of angels clothed in light!
> Behold the spirits of the just
> Whose faith is turned to light!"

The Thessalonians, though blessed with an Apostle for a pastor, were deprived of these sweet assurances. "Miserable comforters are ye all!" would the Church of the present day say to Paul and his brother Apostles. But no doubt Paul could justify *his* method, and add with his usual significance, "I think also that I have the spirit of God."

The foregoing extracts from the epistolary writings are selected from the epistles of Paul. Paul's constitute by far the greater portion of the apostolical epistles, and being written, too, under a greater variety of circumstances, our opportunities of selection, as might be expected, are more abundant from his than from the writings of the other Apostles. The testimony of *one* of the apostolate, however, is the testimony of all. I appeal, then, to the intelligent inquirer after truth, if it is not beyond all dispute unaccountable, if the popular opinions be correct with respect to the soul's immortality, and its capability of happiness and misery between death and resurrection, that the Apostle Paul in his discourses on death, in his *most ardent aspirations*, and also in his pastoral consolations of the bereaved, should be entirely silent about the soul's separate state of conscious enjoyment or suffering immediately after death, and be wholly intent upon "the redemption of the body" at the resurrection of the dead? Doctrines upon which the Apostle is altogether silent, being evidently a stranger to them, modern pastors seem thoroughly informed and most eloquent upon; and, on the other hand, what Christian preachers of the present century rarely speak of, and never hold up prominently, for the encouragement and hope of the Church, the Apostle made the grand themes of his inspired ministry! This is a phenomenon which the advocates of the popular dogmas concerning the soul have to account for.

The popular presentation of Christianity is defective and unintelligible—a system of detached and incongruous doctrines which necessarily fail to produce an enlightened and vigorous piety. The great bulk of most Evangelical congregations is composed of persons who are totally unable to explain the relations of the several articles of their inherited creed. There they exist stored up in motley group in a tenacious memory—a doctrinal mosaic—an awkward complication of the teachings of God and the traditions of men. The understanding can make nothing of them; its attempts have been so often baffled that it has foreborne to attempt. By the interpolation of these traditionary dogmas, every cardinal truth of revelation has been displaced or put in a false light. The landscape of infinite love is blotted by dark and unnatural shadows; "men" appear "like trees walking;" indistinctness and disorder are everywhere introduced. Some cardinal truths, and among them the *first* and *chief*—Immortality the gift of God through Jesus Christ—is entirely rejected! The central sun of the doctrinal system being gone, all other truths have lost their orbit, and move in eccentric and confused course. Divines have labored again and again to reduce this wild confusion to order, but in vain. The ancient regime can alone be restored by the reinstation of the sun of the system—Life in Christ—and the abandonment at once and forever, of the presumptuous claim to the soul's immortality.*

* Dodwell has collected a large amount of important evidence to prove that the early Christian Church did not recognize the dogma of man's natural immortality. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, the cotemporary with the Apostle John, thus writes: "*Life is not from ourselves, nor from our nature, but it is given or bestowed according to the grace of God;* and, therefore, he who preserves this *gift of life*, and returns thanks to Him who bestows it, he shall receive 'length of days for ever and ever.' But he who rejects it and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, *he deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity.* And, therefore, the Lord speaks thus of such unthankful persons—'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much to you?' intimating thereby unto us, that they who are unthankful to him with respect to this short transitory life, which is his gift, the effect of his bounty, *shall be most justly deprived of length of days in the world to come.*"

Christian poetry of the fourth century exhibits the faith of the believers of that age in the doctrine that *life*, in the sense of conscious existence, is the everlasting privilege of the righteous only, and bestowed upon them by Jesus Christ. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, who lived in the fourth and fifth centuries, thus gratefully acknowledges the mercies of redemption—

> "Ligno mea Vita pependit,
> Ut staret mea vita Deo.
> Quid, Vita rependam,
> Pro vita tibi, Christe, mea?" &c.
>
> My Life was slain that I might live,
> My Life did hang upon the tree;
> Teach me what recompense to give
> For life bestowed, my Life, by Thee, &c.

Jacopone da Todi, a Christian poet of the fifteenth century thus wrote—

> Christus mortem non meruit,
> Etsi mori disposuit
> Ut morte mortem tolleret.
>
> Ligno lignum opposuit,
> Et solvit quae non meruit
> Ut debitores liberet.

To what has already been advanced under this section, I will subjoin a few citations from the apostolic writings which demonstrate that the Apostles and early Christians, so far from expecting any intermediate state of happiness between death and resurrection, awaited the second coming of Christ and their own resurrection from the grave, as the time when they expected they should first meet and dwell with their Lord.

"In Christ shall all be made alive, but every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. 15: 22–23.

"Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." 2 Cor. 4: 14.

"When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Colos. 3: 4.

"We know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall [then] see him as he is." John 3: 2.

"When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5: 4.

"And now, little children, abide in him; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." 1 John 2: 28.

The following passage from the Psalms will demonstrate that the expectation of David was identical with that of the Apostles.

"I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Psalm 17: 5.

Here David looks forward to resurrection, and says he shall not be satisfied till then. But if he believed that he went to the divine presence as a disembodied spirit instantly that he died, that then he should behold God's "face in righteousness," why does he refuse to be satisfied until he awakes at the resurrection? In the last verse of the preceding psalm, he says, "in thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Psalm 16: 11.

Surely, "fulness of joy" and "pleasures for evermore" would satisfy the spiritually-minded David! What more of "joy" than "fulness" could he have? And how longer their duration than "for evermore" could he expect his "pleasures" to continue? And all this in the "presence" of Jehovah. David evidently did not expect to enter the Divine presence as a disembodied spirit, and hence he looked onward to the resurrection as the time when his satisfaction should be complete—"I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

It is further manifest from our Lord's farewell discourse to his disciples, that believers at death do not go to him; but that they await his coming to them at the period of the second advent.

"I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. * * Because I live, ye shall live also." John 14: 2, 3, 19.

The popular exposition of this passage represents our Lord's coming as synonymous, and cotemporary with the death of believers. But such an exposition, besides contradicting the manifest testimony of other passages of Scripture, represents "the coming of the Lord" to be as *frequent* as his people die, whereas, according to the Scriptures, his coming is to be for the "second" and last time—and for the special purpose of erecting his throne and establishing his reign in connection with his revived saints, who will then participate in that "first resurrection," which is their exclusive privilege. The meaning of this farewell assurance is explained by the 19th verse, if it be not sufficiently plain in itself, where Christ promises his disciples a restoration to life at a future period—"Because I live, ye shall live also." This promise evidently refers to that period "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day."*

Thus it is beyond dispute, that our Lord and his Apostles concur in bearing the most explicit testimony to the truth of the doctrine, that man has no disembodied and conscious existence between death and resurrection; and that if there were no resurrection, there would be no future life. The popular dogma of a state of partial and preparatory retribution for the disembodied soul immediately after death, is obviously a fiction—a human tradition, receiving its amplest refutation from the Word of God. "God hath *appointed a day*, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." Acts 17: 31. "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12: 48. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this* [not happiness for the saints and misery for the wicked, but] *the judgment*" Heb. 9: 27.

SECTION VII.—IMPLIED AND DOUBTFUL ALLUSIONS TO THE DEAD.

The controversy concerning the doctrine of the dead is encumbered with a peculiar difficulty. Persons, by long habit, associate their preconceived ideas with the term soul, whenever and wherever it may occur; and since this word is very extensively employed by the sacred writers, it is difficult to make apparent the necessity of disburdening the

In Adam vita corruit,
Quam secundus restituit,
Ut vita mortem superet.

Ulmus uvam non peperit,
Quid tamen vita deperit
Quod ulmus uvam sustinet?

Fructum tuum non genui
Et oblatum non respui,
Ut pœna culpam terminet.

A te mortalem habui,
Immortalem restitui,
Ut mors in vitam germinet.

The following literal translation, by Dr. Maitland, is furnished of the above—

"Christ deserved not death, but determined to die, *that by death he might remove death.* He set tree against tree, and paid what he owed not to deliver the debtors. *In Adam fell that life which the second Adam restored, that life might vanquish death.* The elm bears no clusters; why then must life seek to hang upon the elm the bunches of the vine? 'Thy fruit is none of my bearing; when laid upon me, I rejected it not, that my pangs should end thy sin. *For this mortal received from thee, I return thee an immortal, that death may blossom into life.*'"—"*The Church in the Catacombs,*" *pp.* 355–7.

*2 Thes. 1: 10. That the "coming of the Lord," so frequently and prominently adverted to in the Scriptures, does not refer to the period of our *death,* but to the second personal advent of Christ, no intelligent and candid Bible reader can entertain a doubt. For example: Paul thus writes in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians—"We which are *alive,* and remain unto the coming of the Lord." Ch. 4: 15. Peter's question to our Lord, respecting John, gave rise to an opinion which shows that the disciples and their cotemporaries understood our Lord's coming in no figurative, but literal sense. "Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, if I will that *he tarry till I come,* what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple *should not die.*" The coming of the Lord, instead of suggesting to the disciples the season of *death,* banished that idea altogether from their minds.

imagination of that purely human conception of it, which at the present time so generally prevails. The demand that the mind must become, as it were, a blank sheet, that it may receive a new and truer inscription, is felt by many to be a begging the whole question—like asking a garrison to offer no resistance, while we deliberately proceed to storm the citadel. All persons do not equally perceive that until such a surrender of mental preconceptions be made, there is no probability of arriving at a just understanding with respect to the point at issue. To show, however, that this demand is not an unreasonable one, I would request the candid reader to ask himself *whence* he obtained his ideas—if they be the popular ideas—about the soul or spirit* as a separate existence—immaterial, immortal, a man's personal self? Let him search the Bible through, to ascertain the warrant for his long cherished belief, and he will be compelled to acknowledge that such a doctrine is purely traditional and educational. He will discover that the Bible nowhere speaks of "immortal souls," "never dying souls," which, and similar phrases, are so generally current in the religious phraseology of our day; but that it uniformly regards man as a rational animal, dependant upon his organization, however complex, for his conscious personality, and that the scriptural usage of the words *soul* and *spirit* is quite distinct from that which popularly obtains.

It is not a little remarkable what a general disinclination there is among the advocates of the soul's separate and conscious state, to discuss the subject on strictly scriptural grounds. As if intuitively sensible that the Bible is the *least* valuable auxiliary, they repair to the repertory of reason, the opinions of heathen sages, and the alleged unanimity of mankind. But this is a theme upon which revelation can alone positively discourse; and if *it* has revealed nothing concerning the soul as a disembodied personality, what confidence can be placed in mere human and fallible speculations? Appeals again and again are made to the priests of reason, and the psychological jargon of the philosophical pontiffs of antiquity are the inspirations of her oracle. And as for the unanimity of mankind, what authority is here? Granted, for the sake of argument, that mankind are unanimous in their belief of the separateness and personality of the human soul—does this unanimity prove that the opinion is true? If there be *unanimity* among mankind on this subject, which may be questioned, there certainly is not *uniformity* among them, and so far as history enables us to judge, there never has been.† Besides, traditional transmissions we hold to be of little worth, and in the present instance of no worth at all, since these opinions being nowhere authorized, nor even suggested by the inspired oracles, must owe their birth to the conceit of the human mind. And why should we have confidence in the unanimity of the decisions of the human *intellect?*—we have none in the unanimity of the dispositions of the human *heart.*‡ If, therefore, unanimity cannot prove man's *moral* rectitude, why should we presume that it can demonstrate his *intellectual* rectitude? The Bible thus characterizes our fallen race—"There is *none* that *understandeth*, there is none that *seeketh after God.*" Here is unanimity, and what does it prove? Clearly, that neither the *head* nor the *heart* of man is of any worth for the directory of our faith and the government of our life. For our information in this matter, we hold the Bible to be the only competent and exclusive instructor. Notwithstanding the disposition to call in reason's aid in this controversy, we still press the question, "What saith the Scripture?" We observe, and with suspicion, which adds an emphasis to our question, that when thus closely pressed, the defenders of the popular theory eagerly entrench themselves behind certain obscure and disputed passages of Scripture, which we therefore proceed to consider. It may truly be said of such as adopt this questionable course, that "they love *darkness* rather than *light*"—the obscurities of such things as are "hard to be understood," in preference to what it is said "the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." Instead of adopting the just method of interpreting doubtful passages by those which are definite and obvious in their meaning, they cling, with pitiable tenacity, to any shadow of support which such dubious portions may seem to afford.

I think I am fairly permitted to affirm, that what has already been advanced under the preceding sections, is sufficiently definite and unmistakable to justify the conclusion, that both our Lord and his Apostles taught no such doctrines as that the disembodied soul is the human personality, and that the soul or spirit exists after death in a state of consciousness; but that, on the contrary, they taught the state of death to be a complete decease of the conscious being, and that the life will not be rekindled until the period of resurrection. I must be allowed to affirm this until my interpretation of our Lord's discourses and those of his Apostles be shown to be erroneous. The passages of Scripture which I shall cite under this section, it is necessary to bear in mind, are *less explicit* than others which we have already considered. Many of them partake of the character of being either of doubtful significancy, or of having only an apparent, and no real relation to the doctrines in question. Any exposition, therefore, which shall place these passages in direct antagonism with other and more definite portions of the sacred writings *cannot* be correct, since this would be to reverse an obvious canon of interpretation—that which requires doubtful and obscure portions to be explained by such as are of explicit and undoubted meaning. "The law of the Lord is *perfect*"—perfect in all its parts, needing neither additions nor abstractions. There is nothing of discord, but the most perfect harmony distinguishes its oracular breathings. Its voice is *one;* "to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to *this word*—[this *one* "testimony"—this *one* "word"]—it is because there is no light in them."

The following examples of the Scripture usage of the word *spirit*, will demonstrate the impropriety of regarding this term in the sense so commonly attached to it:—

"For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath, [Hebrew, *ruach,*] so that a man hath no pre eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit [Hebrew,

*These terms, in popular discourse, are used interchangeably.

†Vide Hagenbach's Hist. of Doctrines, and the Church Histories.

‡I would caution the reader against interpreting this remark in accordance with the very unscriptural and pernicious notion of man's absolute moral impotence. My observation has no reference to the origin of human depravity, but only to its existence. While the Scriptures characterize the dispositions of men as faulty and corrupt, they also blame and threaten them with punishment on that account. These evil dispositions, unhappily the moral features of the whole race, must therefore be voluntarily acquired and matured.

ruach,] of man that goeth upward, and the spirit [Hebrew, *ruach,*] of the beast that goeth downward, to the earth?" Eccl. 3: 19–21.

In this passage, the word *ruach,* which primarily signifies *breath,* and is derived from the verb *to breathe,* is translated with *two* English words, *breath* and *spirit.* Why should our translators, in this passage, depart from a uniform rendering? The only way I can account for this circumstance is, that they believed in the separate state and immortality of the soul, and therefore rendered this passage—not, I believe, clandestinely, but under the influence of habit, or honest conviction—in harmony with their own doctrinal opinions. Thus, too, they have rendered the following passage, "Who knoweth *the spirit of man that goeth* UPWARD, *and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward, to the* EARTH?" Here a *distinction* is marked between the destiny of the "spirit of man," and that of the "spirit of the beast"—the one is affirmed to go "*upward,*" and the other "*downward.*" But how does this agree with the former part of the same passage? "*As* the one dieth, *so* dieth the other; yea, they have all *one breath*—[or spirit, ruach]—so that a man hath *no preeminence above a beast. All go* unto *one place.*" Now, if "the spirit of man" goes *upward,* and "the spirit of the beast" goes *downward,*" how can it be said that "*as* the one dieth *so* dieth the other?" How can it be affirmed that "a man hath *no preeminence* above a beast? How, if one goes *upward,* and another *downward,* can "*all go* unto *one place?*" The passage is evidently incorrectly rendered in our English version. Instead of reading, "Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward, to the earth?" Luther gives the correct reading, as follows, "Who knoweth *whether* the spirit of man goeth upward," &c. This rendering is supported by the Septuagint and Vulgate, and instead of disagreeing with the former statements of the preacher—as does our English version—is in perfect consistency with them. Thus, the meaning of this interrogatory is, "Who knoweth of any difference in the destinies of man and the beast?" There is *no* difference in respect of their *destinies,* although there is in respect of their natures. Their *destiny* is identical—"*All go* unto *one place*"—"So that a man hath *no preeminence* above a beast."

"There is no man that hath power over the spirit [ruach, breath,] to retain the spirit," [ruach, breath.] Eccles. 8: 8.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit [ruach, breath,] shall return to God who gave it." Eccl. 12: 7.

Compare this passage with that in Gen. ch. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and *breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,* and man became a living soul"—or *person.* In this passage we see that God did *not* breathe into man his *personality,* for Adam was called *man before* he became an animated existence. God breathed into man, and so kindled the human mechanism with life; and when man dies, this gift of life—this breath—returns to God who gave it. If this text teaches that the spirit of man, as the distinct conscious personality of man, goes back again to God who gave it, in this form and with this quality, then we are fairly compelled to agree with Origen in his belief of the *pre-existence* of human souls.

"In whose hand is the soul [margin, life,] of every living thing, and the breath [ruach] of all mankind." Job. 12: 10.

"His breath [ruach] goeth forth, he returneth to his earth." Psalm 146: 4.

"And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above; but there was no breath [ruach] in them. Then said he unto me, Prophesy unto the wind, [ruach,] prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind [ruach], Thus saith the Lord God; Come from the four winds, [ruach,] O breath, [ruach,] and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath [ruach] came into them, and they lived." Ezek. 37: 8, 9, 10.

From these citations it will be seen that the words *breath* and *spirit* are interchangeable; and that in the original Hebrew, one word, *ruach,* stands for both. It is evident that there is no authority in these passages for the popular dogma, that the *spirit* of man is capable of a *distinct existence* in a disembodied state, and that the *spirit is the human personality.*

An examination of the following passages will show that the word *soul,* which so frequently occurs in the sacred writings, is not to be understood in the technical sense which modern theology claims for it.

"Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." [Hebrew, *living soul.*] Gen. 1: 20.

"God created great whales and every living creature." [Heb. *living soul.*] Gen. 1: 21.

"God said let the earth bring forth the living creature." [Heb. *living soul.*] Gen. 1: 24.

"Man became a living soul." Gen. 2: 7. (The same phrase in Hebrew as is translated above, *living creature.*

"But the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice * * * even that soul shall be cut off. * * Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean thing * * even that soul shall cut off from his people. * * For whosoever eateth the fat of the beast * * even the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people." Lev. 7: 20, 21, 25.

"All the days that he separateth himself unto the Lord, he shall come at no dead body." [Heb. *dead* soul.] Num. 6: 6.

"And there were certain men who were defiled with the dead body of a man. [Heb. *dead soul* of a man.] Num. 9: 6.

"Whosoever hath killed any person." [Heb. *any soul.*] Num. 31: 19.

"None can keep alive his own soul." Psalm 22: 29.

"Also in thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the poor innocents." Jer. 2: 4.

"They sought their meat to relieve their souls." Lament. 1: 19.

"Will ye hunt the souls of my people, and will ye save the souls alive that come unto you." Ezek 13: 18.

"To slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive, that should not live." Ezek. 13: 19.

"The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ezek. 18: 20.

"They have devoured souls." Ezek. 22: 25.

"Her princes in the midst thereof are like wolves * * to destroy souls." Ezek. 22: 27.

"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain." Rev. 6: 9.

"I saw the souls of them that were beheaded." Rev. 20: 4.

In the last two quotations, souls are said to cry with a loud voice—to be arrayed in white robes—to sit upon thrones and reign with Christ a thousand years. Surely such a various employment of the word *soul,* as the above extracts show, is sufficient proof that the Scriptures do not justify the popular

idea which is connected with this word. The sacred writers obviously employ this word to designate the individual being, man, in his compound totality, as a rational, sensational, and corporeal existence.

The following passage has been urged in proof of the separate state of the soul as a conscious and indestructible being. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10: 28.

The indestructibility, be it observed, is not affirmed of the *soul itself*, but only in relation to the *power of man*. Man is not able to destroy the soul; but God "is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." I cannot see even the shadow of an argument here, for the dogma that the disembodied soul is the conscious personality of the being man. Nothing more is implied than that the soul is *distinct* from the body; what is its distinction is the point, not to be assumed, but proved. Such a distinction as that which is commonly claimed for it is purely gratuitous. How can it be logically affirmed, from the above words, that the *soul* of man is the *personality* of man, capable of existing and acting distinct from the body? The question to be answered is, what is the meaning of the word *soul* as it occurs in this place? We may ascertain by comparing it with the parallel passage in Luke—"And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have *no more* that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear Him which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell." Luke 12: 4–5. In *this* record of our Lord's words the peculiarity of expression in Matthew's Gospel, upon which so much stress is laid, is altogether absent, the word *soul* does not appear.

Another passage in the Gospel of Matthew will show the value of the word *soul* as employed in the verse under consideration—"Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul?*" Matt. 16: 25–26. Here the word translated *life* twice in the former verse, and *soul* twice in the latter verse, is in each case the same in the Greek. I would ask, why should the same word receive different translations in two intimately connected and current passages? Let the reader substitute the word *soul* in each of the four places of this extract, and he will perceive that in the 25th verse it would sadly grate upon orthodox ears. This was seen by the translators, and hence they employed the word *life* which is the proper term. But why not preserve the same rendering throughout? The translators were believers in the soul's separate existence and immortality, and hence the English Bible has received a coloring from their private belief. There is evidently no reason why one Greek word, occurring four times consecutively, should be translated by *two* different English words. I would request the reader to substitute the word *life* in the 26th verse for the word *soul*, as in the previous verse, and he will find a natural, and, as I believe, the strictly correct meaning of our Lord's words. The parallel passage in Luke's Gospel is as follows—"For what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and *lose himself* or be cast away?" Luke 9: 25. It is very apparent, from the comparison of the identical passages in the two Evangelists, that the word *soul* in Matthew's Gospel, does not comprise the idea of the human personality independently of the corporeal part of the human nature. The comparison of these passages will explain the meaning of the word *soul* in Matthew 10: 28, which we may thus paraphrase, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to destroy the *life*, because there will be a resurrection from the dead; but fear Him which is able to destroy both *life* and body in the fires of Gehenna, when after the resumption of both at the resurrection, the wicked shall experience a punishment which shall end in their complete *destruction*." They shall "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." 2 Thes. 1: 9.

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thes. 5: 23.

Macknight thus paraphrases this text, "And that ye may be enabled to obey this, and every precept of the Gospel, may God, the author of all happiness, sanctify you wholly; and may your whole person, your understanding, your affections, and your actions, be preserved by God, without any just cause of blame." This text, so far from proving that the *spirit* of man can exist apart from the other elements of his composite nature, as the human personality, enumerates these several elements as essential to the complete nature of man. Paul does not say, "I pray God your *spirit* or your soul may, at death, ascend up as your disembodied self to heaven;" but, "I pray God your *complete* self—your whole spirit and soul and body—be preserved free from all occasion of blame unto the second advent of Christ, when he shall come to raise the dead to life." Paul's prayer is, that the believers at Thessalonica may be found among the "blameless" who rise in the "first resurrection at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

I would agree with those to whom Macknight refers, who considered that as the Apostle's design was to teach mankind religion and not philosophy, his prayer means no more but that they might be thoroughly sanctified, of how many constituent parts soever their nature consisted.

"For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." 1 Thes. 5: 9–10.

The last part of this verse has been made to support the popular theory of a state of consciousness for the separate soul. A superficial reader, or one who detached this text from the scope of the Apostle's discourse, might naturally enough, with his pre-conceptions, so interpret the passage. A careful consideration, however, of these words, in connection with the current reasoning of the Apostle, would conduct to a very different conclusion. In the previous chapter, Paul had been describing the circumstances of our Lord's second coming, for the comfort of certain bereaved Thessalonian believers, who seem to have imagined that those who should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," would have considerable advantages above those who were deceased. Paul assures them that these "shall not prevent them which are asleep;" that, on the contrary, "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and they who are "alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air," and so "ever be with the Lord." In allusion to what he had there been saying, Paul assures these Thessalonians that neither will have the advantage over the other with respect to immediate vision of the Lord, and enjoyment of immortality—"Whether we wake or sleep," is of no moment;

Christ died for us that "we should live together with him" at his coming.

And thus Dr. Bloomfield (Greek Testament) expounds this text—"It is meant that whether we be alive or dead *that day*, it matters not; the living with Christ, or enjoying eternal happiness with him, shall be equally our portion."

'For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4: 12.

This verse is a description of the *efficacy of the divine threatening* against all unbelievers. So far from teaching that the "dividing asunder of the soul and spirit" is the liberation of the spirit to exist in a separate state of consciousness, this text affirms that such a separation is *the total destruction* of the human being, and its selection of language is for the purpose of marking more emphatically the *completeness* of the destruction. Professor Stuart in his commentary on this passage says—"In the phrase under consideration, piercing so as to divide or separate life and spirit, plainly means inflicting a wound so deep as shall prove deadly; for that which separates the soul from the system endowed with animal life, is of course deadly."

Macknight also has the following note—"The power of the word of God in piercing to the parting both soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, is understood by some, of the efficacy of the punishments threatened in the Gospel, utterly to dissolve the whole human frame."

"That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." Heb. 6: 12.

Some read this passage as if it affirmed that the departed saints, as disembodied spirits, were in the enjoyment of their heavenly rewards. But this cannot be its meaning, for such an exposition is plainly forbidden by a comparison with a subsequent place in this epistle. What this text asserts is, that there are those whose faith and patience have placed them in the company of them who inherit the promises—not the *fulfilment* of the promises—but *the promises to be at a future time fulfilled.* And hence this same epistle informs us, "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*"—that is, the *fulfilment* of them. Heb. 11: 13. And again, "These all having obtained a good report through faith *received not the promise;* God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. 11: 39–40.

"But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." Heb. 12: 22–23.

The words, "*the spirits of just men made perfect,*" it is alleged, refer to disembodied spirits. The whole passage, it is evident, is highly oratorical; and on this account its expressions are to be treated with less critical severity than would be appropriate if the composition were more dispassionate. Whatever may be the meaning of this passage which is disputed, it is sufficiently clear that in it is no declaration that the "spirits of just men are their *conscious personalities,*" and that they are existing *at this moment* in their perfected state. An attentive consideration of the passage will show that *all* the particulars referred to are *future* and *not present.* Believers "are come" to these privileges *anticipatively now;* they will not "come" to them *actually* until *hereafter.* "The church of the firstborn" are at present only "written" or enrolled in heaven; their *names* are there *now*, their *presence* will be there when, from the gathered generations of the slumbering dead, "the children of the resurrection" shall be summoned to life. The phrase, "the spirits of just men made perfect," is obviously an example of the figure synecdoche, in which the *entire nature* of the human being is expressed by a term which signifies only a part. Thus we use the word *roof*, meaning the whole house; and speak of evil-disposed men as *wicked spirits.* It is important also to note that the subject of the participle translated "made perfect" is not the term *spirits*, but *just men*, and that the Greek would be more literally rendered thus—"Ye are come * * to *the spirits of the perfected just ones.*"* In the preceding chapter, the concluding verse, we are informed that the long catalogue of Old Testament worthies will *not be perfected* until the entire Church of Christ is gathered in from the generations. "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The perfecting of the departed just ones, is at the period of resurrection, when "this mortal shall put on immortality."

"And he stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee let this child's soul come into him again! And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah, and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." 1 Kings 17: 21–22.

"And her spirit came again, and she arose straigtway." Luke 8: 55.

"Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus he gave up the ghost." (Greek, "he expired"—"breathed out." Luke 23: 46.†

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit! * * And when he had said this he fell asleep." Acts 7: 59–60.

In the above and similar passages, nothing more is taught than that *the spirit is essential to the conscious existence of the being man*, who is a compound creature depending for his existence upon his organization. Surely it will not be affirmed that the above convey the information that *the spirit of man exists in a separate state as his conscious personality!* The mind, by force of habit, invests these and kindred texts with the meaning which they popularly receive. Read by a person whose mind is not pre-occupied by the common opinion, these passages could not possibly inculcate such a notion. That must be an astute mind, indeed, which can discover such a mass of extraordinary meaning beneath these simple and popular modes of expression!

The spirit of the widow's son and of Jairus' daughter, came again *not* as some ethereal embodiment of consciousness and intelligence—their proper disembodied selves—to re-occupy, as a dwelling place, the bodily frames which they had vacated, but as the "*spirit of life*" to rekindle their expired consciousness. Thus we read of the re-animation of the two witnesses, "And after three days and a half, the *spirit of life* from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet." Rev. 11: 11. Our Lord having committed his *spirit* (equivalent, I presume, to his human *life*) to his Father, *expired.* In like manner Stephen, having resigned the *breath of his life* to Christ, "*fell asleep.*" That we are not to understand these dying words of our Lord and Stephen to imply that their spirits ascended to God as their

* *Pneumari dikaion teteleiomenon.*
† *Exepnensen.*

living disembodied personalities, is clear; for, besides such a doctrine being nowhere taught in the Scriptures, we are informed that the *personalities* of our Lord and Stephen *died*. It is written of our Lord that *he—not* his body—*expired*. According to the popular anthropology, the *body*, independently of soul or spirit, or both, has *no life*; and, therefore, it would be ridiculous to say that the *dead body died*. So also of Stephen, *he*—the personality Stephen—*fell asleep*. The prayer, "receive my spirit," suggests the idea of the resignation of something over which the dying man has no control—of which he is about to be deprived. Thus said Paul, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him, against that day." 2 Tim. 1: 12. Here is the language of evident solicitude about something with which he, Paul, at a future day, would be compelled to part. Now, if the giving up of the spirit is *not* the giving up of *life*, but the conscious self taking his departure into another state—in Paul's case, as in that of every good man, according to the popular belief—a state of beatific vision and enjoyment—why all these anxious utterances?—*this giving up to another's care*, of what can no longer be cared for by the individual himself! Why does Paul speak of this something of his being kept by Christ "against *that day?*" evidently implying that between the interval of death and the period marked by the terms "that day," this something was *not in his own possession*. If it signifies, as I believe it does, the giving up the *life* to Jesus that it may be kept by him, and in the prayer and faith that he will restore it again when he shall appear "*that day*"—the day of his second advent—then all obscurity vanishes from such passages, and they are found to be in harmonious keeping with Paul's declaration, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 3–4.

"And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear." Matt. 14: 26.

'But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. * * Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke 24: 37–39.

The reference in these passages is *not* to the *human* spirit, but merely to spiritual existence. Had it been said, "they supposed that they had seen *his* spirit," and also, "behold it is I myself, for *my* spirit hath not flesh and bones," then there would be some more plausible defence of the theory of disembodied human existence. In these passages, however, it is not the possessive pronoun, but the indefinite article that is used—"A spirit;" and, therefore, all that these texts imply is, the existence of *other beings* who are called *spirits*.

"I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth,) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth,) how that he was caught up into paradise." 2 Cor. 12: 2–4.

This passage is confessedly one of the most remarkable in Paul's writings. Its obscurity is apparent since Paul himself, with a double emphasis, confesses that he was altogether ignorant of what had occurred to him. And, therefore, if the subject of this extraordinary vision or translation, or whatever else it may have been, declares that he "cannot tell" anything at all about it, beyond the fact that he was a spectator and auditor of heavenly things; and that this preternatural event, in the method and circumstances of its accomplishment only "God knoweth," it surely must be as vain as presumptuous for me to stop to inquire about, or to offer any opinion upon it. On the expressions, "in the body or out of the body," it will suffice to remark, that Paul *could not* mean that his soul was his conscious personality, capable of a separate existence apart from his body, and that in this disembodied state he might have been "caught up to the third heaven"—I am justified in affirming that he could not mean because it would be in manifest contradiction to what he had taught this same Church in the 15th chapter of his first epistle. Since these passages have already come under consideration in a former section, (Section VI.,) I refer the reader to what is there said in support of this affirmation.

The phrases, "in the body" and "out of the body," "being clothed" and "unclothed," "in this tabernacle," "our earthly house," our "building of God," and others of this class, are obviously familiar *Hebrew images*, equivalent in their meaning to the two states, *mortal* and *immortal*, of which man is capable. To wrest these images in support of the popular theory of separate souls, is to do manifest violence to the sacred Scriptures which abound in statements that prove the impossibility of such a condition of the human nature. Therefore, when Paul says, "Whether in the body, I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell," I understand him to say that he did not know whether he was for the time being in a *natural* or *glorified* state. "There is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body*," says Paul: he nowhere speaks of man existing without a body at all.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." 1 Peter 3: 18–20.

This text is one of acknowledged difficulty by all expositors. What its precise meaning is, I do not pretend to say; and I shall only make a few remarks rather by way of pointing out some of its difficulties, than to furnish any dogmatic interpretation of it. Let it be observed, then, that the time when Christ preached was *not before* his incarnation, nor was it between his death and resurrection, but *after* his resurrection. The words read, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, by which—[rather, '*in* which']—also he went and preached;" that is, in which "new" or resurrection life, "he went and preached." Now, the question presents itself, who were these "*spirits in prison*" to whom Christ after his resurrection "went and preached?" To the answer that they were the disembodied *spirits of men* who were disobedient in the days of Noah, grave objections immediately suggest themselves. Here would be a grand authority for the Popish dogmas of purgatory, and prayers for the dead, if we allow that our text teaches that Christ preached to the spirits of dead *men*—that is, offered salvation to them; for such is the uniform meaning of *preaching* in the Scriptures. Besides, such an exposition contradicts the protestant belief that death *closes* the probation and religious opportunities of mankind; and still further, the testimony of the word of God whereby we are assured that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this the judgment*." For

my own part, I have not the least doubt that the phrase, "*spirits in prison*," refers not to *men*, but to certain *spiritual beings* who were disobedient in the days of Noah in some such way as to bring them within the reach of the Christian redemption. Perhaps that event (Gen. 6) of "the sons of God" who were enamored with "the daughters of men," whose progeny were *unnatural*, called in the record *giants*, may have some connexion with this text.

Peter, in his second epistle, says, "If God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, [not Gehenna, the place of future punishment, but Tartarus,*] and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Peter 2: 4. This seems to refer to some other angelic defection than that of Satan and his angels; for these latter with their chief, who is "the prince of the power of the air," roam at large through heaven and earth. Satan "goes about as a roaring lion." These evil spirits are evidently not bound down in "chains of darkness."

Again, the Apostle Jude speaks of "angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. *Even as* Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner *to these*† [angels,] *giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange* [margin, *other*] *flesh*, are set forth for an example." Here the Apostle Jude states that certain "angels" left their own habitation, and went after *strange* or *other flesh*, committing fornication, and that these angels are in chains of darkness. May not this explain who "the sons of God" were, who, "in the days of Noah—the *precise time* that Peter states—(1 Peter 3: 20)—"saw the daughters of men." [the "strange" or other flesh,] that they were fair? And their sin being in connection with the human race, they may be in some way advantaged by Christ's preaching to them after the completion of the work of redemption. Here, to say the least, are very remarkable coincidences; and I venture to think that this comparison of passages suggests the true interpretation of the text in question. Whether this suggested exposition be right or wrong, the phrase, "*spirits in prison*," cannot be proved to be *human* spirits; and, therefore, can never be pressed into the popular service in justification of the belief in disembodied human existence.

"Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." 1 Peter 4: 5–6.

*Greek, *tartarosas*. It is commonly assumed, but without sufficient authority, that Tartarus is equivalent to the term Gehenna, and signifies the place of punishment for the wicked. If Peter meant to convey the idea that these "spirits in prison" were in Gehenna, why did he not use that word which is uniformly employed to denote the place of punishment? Or if he meant that they were in the same state as *deceased men*, why did he not use the regular term *hades*? The term *hades*, it appears, would have been unsuitable, because it denotes the state of the *unconscious dead*; while these were beings in a state of consciousness, capable of listening to, and being influenced by, the preaching of Christ. Why does he depart from the strict usage of the Scripture writers, and substitute another word, *Tartarus*, in this place? Evidently we are not to understand, in this place, the Gehenna of the lost, for there is *salvation thence*; and Peter himself assures us that the fires of Gehenna are *not yet kindled*. 2 Peter 3: 7.

†Jude 6, 7. It will be observed that I have introduced the words "to these" in the text, and have explained in a parenthesis their probable reference. The Greek is written thus, *ton omoion toutois tropon*. The word *toutois* (to these) is left untranslated in our English version; and which, being in the masculine gender, agrees with the *aggelous* (angels) of verse 6.

This text is sometimes adduced in support of the doctrine of disembodied spirits; but I humbly conceive that it has nothing whatever to do with the question. It does *not* state, as some suppose, that the men were dead when the gospel was preached to them, but that it was preached to them *before* they died. The sense of the passage may be thus explained—"For this cause was the gospel preached to them who are *now* dead." Dr. Whitby has the following note—"The gospel hath been preached to them, not that it shall be preached to them *when dead*." And Dr. Hammond, in his paraphrase, thus writes, "For thus hath he formerly proceeded with the sinners of the old world, and all others that are now long ago dead, first preached to them *when they were alive* as now unto us." Many expositors consider that the latter part of this text alleges two conditions of man's conscious being; one in this world, and the other in the state intermediate between death and resurrection. Dr. Boothroyd, for example, says, "They were condemned to die, as to men to be no more conversant with them; but when the animal life is destroyed, and its union with the spirit dissolved, each lives as to God, is conversant with them in the spirit. * * In this view, the text is a proof of the existence of the spirit in a separate state." But this exposition plainly contradicts the uniform teaching of Christ and his Apostles in reference to the state of the dead. We have already ascertained, from the consideration of several most definite passages in the discourses of our Lord and his Apostles, that man has no consciousness—no life between death and resurrection. And we shall, moreover, be the less disposed to attach much weight to any authoritative interpretation of this and similar difficult passages, when we remember what Dr. Adam Clarke says, that "there are as many different translations of this verse and comments upon it, as there are translators and commentators." Notwithstanding the acknowledged difficulties of the latter part of this text, I do not conceive that it is incapable of an interpretation in strict accordancy with what we have ascertained to be the teaching of Scripture on the doctrine of the state of man in death. I would paraphrase the verse thus, "The gospel was preached in the life-time of them who are now dead; and to them for this cause, namely, that although they must be judged in the flesh after the manner of men—that is, that although they must experience the common lot of man, which is to die—yet that they might live according to God in the spirit—that is, that they might, notwithstanding, be made alive again in a spiritual existence—namely, resurrection—when Christ shall be ready to judge the quick and the dead." Whether this be the Apostle's meaning, I cannot positively affirm; it is, at all events, a sense of which the passage is capable, and which agrees with the subject of the Apostle's discourse.

That system, however, can have but small support, and must be of very doubtful merit, which clings so tenaciously to ambiguous texts like the present, in defence of opinions which so obviously clash with the plainer statements of the inspired word.

Finally, the sense of our Lord's *transfiguration* has been supposed to authorise the popular belief in the soul's separate existence, as the human *personality*, in the state between death and resurrection

The appearance of Elijah in this memorable scene can cause no surprise, since we are informed that his, like Enoch's, was an exception to the common lot of men. And the presence of Moses is *no proof*

that he still exists, or that he ever existed, as a *disembodied spirit*, for in that scene he appeared in a *glorified body*. The death of Moses, although it is expressly said that he died in the land of Moab, is not unconnected with the mysterious. We read that God "buried him," and that his resting place was never known, (Deut. 34;) and therefore, if it could be shown from the Scriptures that he still lives, it would contribute nothing to the popular faith. I would, however, simply remark on this event that there is no inconsistency in supposing that Moses should be raised from death, in his spiritual body, in order that he might be present on this august occasion.

The transfiguration was a typical representation of Christ's second advent, and of its cotemporaneous events. "Verily, I say unto you," said our Lord to his disciples, "there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see *the Son of man coming in his kingdom*. And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him." Matt. 16: 28, and 17: 1–3. This vision, then, exhibits to us "the Son of man *coming* in his kingdom;" here is the key to its interpretation. We are not to look here for the general characteristics of Christ *in* his kingdom, which he will establish on the earth, according to prophetic assurances, but for the characteristics of Christ "*coming* in his kingdom." When this event shall take place, the "*dead in Christ*" shall be raised, and the *living saints* shall be "changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." In the tranfiguration, we behold the types of these events in the persons of Moses and Elias. Moses is the type of the raised *dead*, and Elias of the changed *living* saints. We have, in this wonderful vision, a typical exhibition of "the first resurrection," which is cotemporary with our Lord's *coming* in his kingdom. This was evidently the design of the vision. And it is in keeping with this design that the conversation between the glorified Jesus and Moses and Elias, was "*his decease* which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

Besides this principal instruction, there is another of very considerable importance—more especially to a Jew—which this vision incidentally furnishes. Peter, not apprehending the nature of this scenic instruction, and imagining that the kingdom of Christ was then and there about to be established, would localize and *equally* honor our Lord and Moses and Elias, by constructing for them "three tabernacles." His mistake was very significantly corrected by the immediate voice of Jehovah, distinguishing Christ as the pre-eminent personage, and challenging for *him* an especial and peculiar reverence, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. *Hear* HIM."

There is no reason why Moses should not put off his glorified form and return again to the quiescence of the grave, until the resurrection of the saints, since Christ only assumed temporarily *his* glorified form, and divested himself of it when he left the mount. The case of Moses is materially different from that of the prophet Elijah. The former, unlike the latter, died and was buried; and it seems necessary on this account to suppose that Moses returned again after this event to the state of death. The contrary supposition that he lives in a glorified state is difficult, I think, to be reconciled with the important fact that Christ is the "first fruits," and "first begotten" from the dead. There is an obvious propriety, as well as necessity, that the Ransomer of the dead should be the *first to rise*. It is specially to be noted, that although at the moment of Christ's expiring on the cross we are informed that the rocks were rent, and exposed the resting places of certain dead saints, it was not until "after his resurrection" that "the saints which slept arose and came out of the graves." Matt. 27: 51–53. If it be said that Moses might enter upon his resurrection life in virtue of Christ's resurrection, and that the priority would be merely in point of time, while the energy and justification would still be derived from the resurrection of our Lord, it is enough to reply that the Scriptures attach great importance to the circumstance of *time*. For example, "*Every man in his own order;* Christ the *first fruits; afterward* they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. 15: 23. Whether we can or cannot explain all the circumstances of this grand historic event, there is obviously no authority here for the doctrine of the separate existence and personality of the human spirit. Like every other text that has been cited, it either disproves the popular doctrine, or has nothing to do with the question. The testimony of the Word of God is both abundant and satisfactory; its voice is intelligible and decided in condemnation of the prevalent theory.

If this question were of small account in connection with practical religion, it would scarcely deserve the prominence which we seek to give it; although truth, whatever may be its relative magnitude, is ever to be desired rather than error. But the question is a *vital* one—vital to the theoretic integrity of God's word—vital to the proper adjustment of its several doctrines; and vital to the development of a scripturally religious character. And, therefore, the charge of our Lord is painfully applicable to every advocate and promulgator of the popular theory—"Ye make void the law of God *through your traditions*."

SECTION VIII.—PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEAD.

It is possible that the philosophic reader, who may have honored me with his attention thus far, may experience some surprise at my obvious disregard of every objection which the human reason might urge against my conclusions. In explanation, it appears to me that independent reasoning is a grand impertinence here, since the state of man in death is a subject of revelation; whose teachings, therefore, must be accepted as authoritative and final. This question comes within the scope of Scripture exegesis, and not of philosophical argumentation; we have for our information on this solemnly interesting inquiry, a "Thus saith the Lord," and therefore our appeal should be exclusively to the Scriptures. I would respectfully suggest to my brethren in Christ the importance of drawing broadly and obviously the line of demarcation between the verities of the inspired Word, and the speculative results of human inquiry, which in psychological studies can never, I apprehend, claim a higher authority than that of the possible or the probable. Much safer would it be for us to deny even the possibility of psychology, as a science, and renounce it for ever as profitless and vain, than suffer its guesses to become authority in matters of religion. This, I seriously think, has been done. The mind of man, too conceited and confident of its own achievements, is naturally exposed to the danger of seeking to be wise above what

is written, and of transferring the results of its unlawful, or at best imperfect labors, side by side with the sacred certainties of the teachings of God. The great mass of traditions, both Jewish and Christian, are the historical proofs of this lamentable tendency. It is a significant circumstance, that even the sacred canon of Scripture could not close without a most impressive warning to our meddling race against tampering with the written revelation. Rev. 22: 18–19.

If we may judge by the impatience which is exhibited in our day of any attempt to elicit a meaning from the Word of God, other than what is acknowledged by the general body of professing Christians, it would appear that the Church denies the possibility of its being wrong in any article of fundamental importance.

The late Professor Vinet thus appositely remarks, "All those truths which are now admitted to be incontrovertible, with reference to society, were for a length of time regarded as problematical. The true problem, however, is to discover how such truths could ever have been questioned. In every branch of science or of the arts, the human mind progresses more rapidly. It is slow only when searching for the right. It deduces with difficulty, and after much tedious investigation, the direct consequences of principles it has previously admitted. Even now, after eighteen centuries of Christianity, *we are very probably involved in some enormous error*, of which Christianity will, at some future time, make us ashamed, as it has already done with regard to torture, to slavery, and to compulsion in matters of religion. We believe that this will continue to be the case until Christianity shall have fully developed all its excellences. *We extract but by little and little those treasures which are abundantly contained within its bosom.*"*

It surely will not be alleged that the progress of intellect is necessarily a voucher for the progress of piety; nor should it be pleaded that the lateness of the period in the Christian dispensation in which we live, renders it impossible that the Church should, in some grand points, be still wrong. To suppose the impossibility of being religiously wrong because we live in the nineteenth century of the Christian era—the last time of the last times—if we interpret rightly "the signs" of our "times"—is to forget the inspired portraiture of our advanced and advancing period. "In the last days," says Paul, "perilous times shall come, * * having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3: 1–5. "In the last days," the Church, so far from being proof against lapses into error by the giant strides of a rapidly developing intellect is, for example, to become infidel on a grand topic of religious interest and hope, "*Where is the promise of his coming?*" (2 Pet. 3: 4,) is to be its unbelieving inquiry. The Church is not to lose its outward characteristics and distinction by descending into the depths of shameless vice: it is to preserve its visibility by being habited in the decent exterior of religious profession. Its bad state will not be marked by that kind of daring and blasphemous infidelity which would annihilate its distinctiveness as the professing Church, but by the infidelity of a more decent, albeit not of a more reputable, nature. The "last days" are to be distinguished by a very general profession of religion; and in this general religious profession, since it will not be the vitality, but the form and affectation of piety, will lie the "perilous" character of the times. The sin of these days shall be, that men have "the form of godliness," all the while they are practically "denying the power thereof."

I have already referred to some remarkable examples of discrepancy between the development of the religious lives of the early believers, and the topics of apostolic preaching, and the religious life and preaching in our own day. True believers are spoken of in the Scriptures as those who "*seek for* glory, and honor, and *immortality*," and whose reward is "*eternal life*," (Rom. 2: 7:) professing believers in the present day "seek" not "immortality" as mortal and perishable beings; they spiritualize, and hence destroy the meaning of this text. Paul taught that "the *gift* of God is *eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*," (Romans 6: 23;) professing believers of the present day, claim to possess "eternal life" as "never dying souls," and hence reject endless life as the gift of God through Christ. The Scriptures of both testaments abound with promises of Christ's second coming; and the exhortations to "wait" and "watch" for that event are earnestly and frequently repeated The Apostles and believers in primitive times derived some of their most exquisite satisfactions from contemplating that event. Let the reader peruse carefully the two epistles to the Thessalonians in exemplification of this statement. Our Lord concluded his gracious vision to John in Patmos, by saying that the faithful preacher of his gospel will give considerable prominence to the speediness of his coming, "He which testifieth these things saith, surely I come quickly;" to which that Apostle responded his earnest "Amen," and added, "Even so, come Lord Jesus." Rev. 22: 20. The religious life of the Thessalonian believers, Paul thus describes, "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and *to wait for his Son from heaven* whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." 1 Thess. 1: 9–10. Our Lord taught his disciples to pray for his second advent, and the establishment of his millennial reign on the earth, in that model prayer which bears his name—"Thy kingdom come * * for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory for ever." Do expectation and earnest prayer for Christ's second coming, characterize the piety of modern Christians? Is not the doctrine of a reigning Messiah on this earth notoriously unpopular now? Where is the Church's united "Amen" to the declaration, "Lo, I come quickly?" What Church among us can be fairly characterized as was that at Thessalonica? Is not that a nearer representation of the Christianity of the nineteenth century of which Peter prophesied when he said, "There shall come in the last days scoffers saying, *where is the promise of his coming?*" The Bible reflects *another* image than that of modern Christianity.

I have alluded also, at some length, to the fact that the resurrection from the dead formed the chief topic of our Lord's and his Apostle's ministry. Our Lord thus distinguished himself, "I am the Resurrection and the Life;" and thus explained the nature and chief benefit of his redemption, "I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 39–40, 44, 54. Paul thus reasoned to the Church of his time, "If one died for all, then were all dead." 2 Cor. 5: 14. "Ye are dead, and your life is *hid with Christ* in God. *When* Christ who is *our life* shall appear, *then* shall *ye also appear* with him in glory." Col. 3: 3–4. On the resurrection of the dead, Paul founded the entire value of the Gospel. All was vain and profitless "*if the dead rise not.*" It was to him and to all, a matter

* "Essay on the Profession of Personal Religious Conviction," pp. 37–8.

of indifference how they lived; they might relax the ties of all moral obligation with impunity, "*if the dead rise not.*" Deceased believers in Christ were all "perished;" there was no future life, "if the dead rise not." Hence, at each of his several audiences in Jerusalem, before the Sanhedrim, before Felix, Festus and Agrippa, and at Athens, he held forth the hope of the promise made unto the fathers—*resurrection from the dead.* Every glimpse that we get of the Apostle's ministry, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, reveals to us that resurrection from the dead, through the resurrection of Christ, was their common and prominent theme. Towards this, as their speech indicates, all their thoughts converged. Thither they travelled in their plain historic discourses; and when they reached this sublime topic, there they stood as by the grand central fact of their religious system, pleading with and persuading their hearers to be reconciled to God, and accept of *this* salvation. The examples are furnished on the day of Pentecost—on the occasion of healing the lame man—on Peter and John's first arraignment before the council—on the arraignment of all the Apostles. It thus incidentally peers out when we are told of the indignation of the Jews, because they "preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead;" and that "with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." Contrast the prominence given to the doctrine of resurrection by the Apostles, with the absolute abeyance in which it is held by preachers of the present day. It is impossible to avoid surprise at these manifest discrepancies, to instance no others. The earnest mind, anxious to possess truth and to serve God in the manner which He requires, will not be satisfied with merely marking these extraordinary differences, he will ask reasons, and push his inquiries to a satisfactory conclusion. The Puritan of the nineteenth century will demand a revision of the doctrinal basis of Christianity; he is satisfied that such obvious incongruities must owe existence to some radical error which has found a place among the credenda of the orthodox faith. This error we have shown elsewhere,* is the belief in the separate personality and immortality of the human soul. The rejection of this doctrine, it is evident, will alone restore harmony to the disjointed system of doctrinal and practical religion which, unhappily, is the condition of modern Christianity. Man, as mortal, becomes a seeker for immortality. Destitute of eternal life, "the gift of God," which "is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," is appropriate to his great necessity. Incapable of existing in a separate state, as a disembodied conscious soul, the anxiety of the Apostle accords with his own solicitude, "If I may but attain to the resurrection of the dead!"—and his experience is identical with that of the first Christian disciples, "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Resurrection from the dead—the grand topic of the Apostolic ministry—this doctrine to a being who must die, and yield himself up to death's dominion, is "good tidings of great joy." Resurrection dependant on the second coming of Christ, the attitude of the believer will be that of the faithful servant who awaits in expectation his Lord's return; and his prayer will be, habitualiy and fervently, "Come, Lord Jesus," "come quickly!" In this view, obviously all is harmonious between the provisions of the Gospel and the condition of our fallen race. But the Church teaches that immortality is the natural constitution of the human soul; and affirms that this fractional part of man's being is his personality, capable of existing in a state of disembodiment, and surviving in life its separation from the body. This is the great and mischievous tradition of Christian scribes which makes "void the law of God." So long as this dogma shall retain its place in the Christian creed, the Church will be the theatre of doctrinal strifes and divisions; the Christian character will remain imperfectly and unsatisfactorily developed; Christian professors, off their guard, will be neither waiting nor watching for their Lord; and Christ, if he come during such a state of things, shall scarce "find faith in the earth." The voice of Christ proclaims, "I am come that ye might have *life!*" The Church virtually responds to that call, "Thy coming to bestow *life* is needless, we are immortal souls and cannot die!" Thus the Church, like our first mother, has listened with impious credulity to the father of lies—"Ye shall not surely die;" and turns away from Christ's touching complaint, "Ye will not come TO ME that ye might have LIFE."

Allusion has been made to the comparative neglect of the doctrine of resurrection from the dead, in the practical Christianity of our day. It is evident that what is thus practically denied must, on the popular theory, be denied altogether. Believing, as the generality of Christians do, that the soul of man never dies, and that the soul is a man's proper self, then how is it possible that there can be any resurrection of the dead? Paul, by a very plain analogy, assures us that our resurrection body will not be the body which we possess now. "That which thou sowest, *thou sowest not the body that shall be,* but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but *God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.* * * * *So* also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in *corruption*, it is raised in *incorruption.* * * It is sown a *natural body*, it is raised a *spiritual body.* There is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body.*" "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." It is popularly taught that the resurrection only applies to the *bodies* of believers. But Paul declares that the resurrection body will be *another* body—a "*spiritual body.*" "Thou sowest not that body which shall be." If, therefore, *the corruptible body* is *never raised again*, and the *soul never dies, nothing rises from the dead.* The popular theory necessarily makes the resurrection an *impossibility.**

To the view here presented of the utter extinction of man in death, it is common to object on independent and philosophical grounds. We are told that "extinct spirit is a contradiction in terms;" that identity cannot be preserved between the being that died, and that which is raised, if in death the conscious personality ceases to exist. But can these arguments have any solid foundation? Are they not framed upon the necessary ignorance of the human mind in relation to such matters? What do we know of the term "spirit" to justify the gratuitous affir-

* "Life and Death."

* If it be asked, with what body shall the wicked arise? I can only reply, the Bible does not furnish an answer to this question. The wicked will be raised identically, the same beings, to be judged, punished, and destroyed. Paul answers the question, "with what body do they come?" in reference to those who are to live for ever; he says nothing concerning the resurrection body of the wicked. This information would only gratify an impertinent curiosity, and not contribute to a profitable enlightenment, or stimulate the obedience of faith. It is enough to know that the unjust, as well as the just, shall arise, since the whole race has been redeemed by Christ from the grave. He tasted death for every man. The question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do" the wicked "come?" intrudes into the secret things which belong to God.

mation that the connection with it, of the adjective "extinct," is a "contradiction in terms?" And has philosophy proved beyond the possibility of contradiction, what constitutes personal identity, so that it may be dogmatically asserted that to blot an intelligent being out of existence, is to destroy that being's identity? Paul had to do with persons of this class, who deny the possibility of what they cannot themselves comprehend. "But some man will say, how are the *dead* raised up?" How can they who have *died live again?* How can their identity be preserved? To which the Apostle returned the simple and plain-spoken answer, "Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened *except it die.*" As if Paul had said, the terms are necessarily correlative—what has not been *dead*, cannot be made *alive from the dead;* resurrection from the dead implies the previous state of being dead. If the spirit of man is the man, and the spirit never dies, then how is it possible to avoid the common-sense conclusion—*man never dies*, and therefore can *never rise from the dead?* An eminent living poet has replied wisely and scripturally to the question—

> "But is it *mind* which shall re-rise?
> Man were
> *Not man without the mind* he had in life.
> * * * * * * *
> Man's nature, *physical and psychical*,
> Will be *together raised*, changed, glorified."
> BAILEY'S FESTUS, p. 25.

The composite nature, whatever may be the number and character of its constituent parts, whose union is essential to the existence of the one being, called man, must, in death, experience such a change as constitutes the decease of the conscious being, otherwise the being *man* cannot *re-rise*. The question, distinctively and exclusively referring either to the mind or the body, is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. Does the resurrection of man refer either to the *body* or to the *mind?*—is equivalent to asking—does the *whole* mean any particular *part* of the whole? This obvious absurdity is involved in the theological question, "But is it *mind* which shall re-rise?" and which the poet-theologian elegantly rebukes in his philosophical and scriptural reply, "Man were not man without the mind he had in life."

But it is sufficient to refute the objection which the reason of man suggests, on the ground of personal identity, by directing attention to the historical proof furnished in our Lord's transfiguration. In that memorable event we see that it is possible for the human personality to experience such a change as is involved in the transition from the natural to the glorified state, and yet identity be preserved; for although our Lord experienced such a transfiguration, his disciples knew him to be their Master. Indeed, to every objection which human philosophy may advance against the possibility of recovering the identical life, which has once ceased to be, it suffices to reply, as did our Lord to the ancient Sadducees, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the *power of God*"—and to ask, with Paul, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that *God should raise the dead?*"

If the subject of this treatise have appeared uninviting, it will, nevertheless, be acknowledged that erroneous conceptions concerning the doctrine of the dead cannot fail to seriously prejudice other important articles of Christian doctrine. The parent of this, and of many other pernicious traditions is, as we have seen, the belief of the personality and immortality of the human soul. This absurd notion has made men tolerate another great absurdity—the dogma of life *in death*, a contradiction in terms; it has made them infidel of the resurrection-life, which Christ came to be—which Apostles preached and aspired after—for which the generations of the just have been gathered, and are yet gathering, and which shall be developed when Christ, "the Resurrection and the Life," shall come, "the second time without sin unto salvation." It has led the Church to expect what will never be realized, and to be totally negligent of what is "nigh at hand, even at the doors." The Church is expecting to be gathered to her Lord by piecemeal; as if it were possible that Christ should accept His bride by fragmentary instalments. She is expecting to live before "Christ, who is our life, shall *appear*," and she is created anew by Christ Jesus. In the anticipation of entering into life as disembodied and immortal souls, the modern Church groans not, as did the ancient, "for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Christians are now expecting to live and reign with Christ, between death and resurrection, hence our preachers, with few exceptions, tell not of the personal coming of the Lord, to erect his throne and reign with his saints. "He" who professedly "testifieth these things," saith, *not now*, "Lo, I come quickly;" and few are the enthusiastic responses of acquiescence, like that of the seraphic John, in the speedy coming of Jesus, "Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus!" The Church has no disposition to adopt this language now—she can only understand Christ's coming as the season of her own *death*, instead of the glorious hour of redemption—the season of her new and immortal *life*. The Church now thinks it no privilege "to eat of the *hidden Manna*"—the "life" which is "*hid with Christ* in God." She has no faith in a "hidden" life, her life she believes has ever been apparent, dwelling in immortal fulness in her own bosom. No countenance beams now with intelligent and ecstatic joy, save here and there one, when the Saviour's promise is echoed, "I will give him" that overcometh "the *morning star*." Jesus Christ, "the bright and morning star"—the "day-star"—the "day-spring from on high," who first dawns upon the dark valley of the shadow of death, and first announces, as "the resurrection and the life," that the resurrection-morn has come—is almost forgotten in the unscriptural expectation of his coming in some figurative sense at death. These are some of the evils which have accrued to the doctrinal and practical Christianity of our times, through the belief of the dogma of natural immortality.

And while the reformed Churches are thus seriously marred in their scriptural integrity, through their belief in their separate state and immortality of the soul, it is obvious what a broad and firm platform this fundamental error affords for the gigantic structure of the Romish Apostacy. The dogma, that *in death the human being still lives* as a disembodied spirit, has furnished the Church of Rome with ample means for manufacturing her pernicious heresies. On this foundation she has reared her idol-temple, in which she pays devout homage and offers up prayers to the Virgin Mary, the Apostles, "the whole army of martyrs" and saints. By the favor of this dogma she has dug her purging-pit of purgatory, whither, with pious hardihood, she consigns her miserable votaries. By its means she has diverted the sympathy and prayers of the pious from the needy living, to expend, uselessly, upon the unconscious dead. By it she wields her iron sceptre of despotism, like another Eblis, over the infernal world; and with horrible effrontery, in the name of

religion, too, demands a fee to be merciful. The worship of the Virgin, the invocation of saints, purgatory, masses, and prayers for the dead, indulgences—all stand upon the dogma of the soul's immortality and separate state. And as these are among the mightiest engines of Papal domination and tyranny, Rome herself owes the power she wields to the faith of this dogma. Let it be denied by her own communion—let it be seen and avowed that there is no future life for the human being *until* the resurrection from the dead, and Rome Papal, like her Pagan prototype, would cease to scourge the earth with her "rod of iron"—this huge pile of apostacy would fall with a thunder crash that should echo through the nations, and then would be heard the prophetic cry of astonishment and derision, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen!" Rome, however, reforms not herself, she is ripening for another kind of ruin—this catastrophe awaits other means.

I would respectfully remind my brethren in the ministry, of the responsibility of their position as the teachers of the Church, and suggest to them the propriety of reviewing the basis of their doctrinal instruction, that they be not obnoxious to the charge of "teaching, for doctrines, the commandments to men." And let not the reformed Churches rashly conclude that they cannot be wrong in the supposed scriptural integrity of their long cherished faith. This were to exhibit a lamentable ignorance of their own history, and the general history of Christianity, and were to arrogate to the masses of their own communion the infallibility which they justly deny to the Roman Pontiff. Infallibility is not in human creeds, nor conventional orthodoxy; it is the attribute of God and His revealed Truth, and therefore our sole appeal in this, as in all doctrines of religious controversy, is "to the law and to the testimony;" for "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

It can be scarcely necessary to say to my reader, who has accompanied me through these pages, that my aim has been not to encourage a vain curiosity, by searching into things which are hid from mortal eyes, but to demonstrate the necessity of retracing our unconscious footsteps, which have presumptuously, and in the name of religion, too, advanced into forbidden ground. With all humility, but with very strong convictions, I feel bound to assert that the professing Church, in relation to the topics here discussed, is occupying unscriptural and untenable ground, and I would earnestly call upon every lover of the truth as it is in Jesus, to "despise not prophesyings, but prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." It is beyond all reasonable contradiction that the Bible nowhere teaches that deceased believers enter upon their reward, nor that deceased unbelievers experience their recompense, either in part or wholly as disembodied spirits; but that with respect to the righteous, as they are gathered out of every passing generation, and by their faith and holy life prove themselves the "chosen generation" and "peculiar people" of the Great Ransomer, so are they gathered in death to them who are heirs of the promises, and whose peaceful slumbers shall not be disturbed until the last generation of the just—the last sheaf of the living harvest, shall be gathered in. It is a part of the grand scheme of human redemption that none shall anticipate before others their heavenly inheritance. Of the primitive faithful, it is written, "These all, having obtained a good report, through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. 11: 39–40. "The whole creation," like a laboring mother, "groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now," eager for the birth—"the manifestation of the sons of God." Then "shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day"—then "shall a nation be born at once!" Believers possessed of the scriptural intelligence and immortal hope of Paul, say with him, "And not only so," but "even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." "O how vast the immortal awakening! Who can lift his mind to the greatness of the occasion! Where is the height from which we can command a view of the sublime spectacle? In prospect of it, Jesus said, 'the hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' As the first fruits of them that sleep, he has arisen and appeared before God, the certain pledge of the great harvest-home. 'Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision.' The wide earth shall 'stand thick,' and wave with the ocean plentitude of life. * * And to consummate the triumph, life on that day will be crowned with immortality; it will not merely be restored, but ennobled, exalted to the highest state of security and glory it can sustain. From the ruinous heap of every grave a living structure shall arise, built up into an imperishable monument of 'the Resurrection and the Life;' in the stead of corruption, it shall be inaccessible to decay; 'for neither can they die any more; they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.' * * Earth has been often that scene of splendid triumphs, the fame of which has filled the world, and reverberated from age to age; but how tame, how trifling the greatest achievements of man compared with this! a triumph which not only effaces the remembrance of all that man has done, but even eclipses the glory of the divine exploits; 'the former things shall no more come into remembrance.' Here man may indulge in wonder without loss of dignity; not to be astonished here would be unnatural! Christ himself is represented, ages before his incarnation, as contemplating this scene with boundless delight—as rehearsing his victory over death from eternity. From the bosom of the Father he looked on through the vista of time, while the successive parts of his great work passed in slow and stately procession, till he beheld the scene of the rising dead; all the intermediate ages instantly vanished; he saw, in anticipation, the king of terrors disarmed beneath his feet, the world flooded with light and life, the song of myriads of myriads reached his ear, shouting his name as their Great Deliverer; and, with holy impatience to realize the scene, he exclaimed, 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues! O grave, I will be thy destruction!' And during the interval, till he came in the flesh, did his interest in the prospect appear to have evaporated? What truth did he more frequently or solemnly teach? Thrice in rapid succession, he exclaimed, 'I will raise him up at the last day,' as if he sought to find, in the bare repetition of the truth, a solace and compensation for deferring the event. Nor, since his ascension, does his desire to realize it appear to have suffered the least abatement. On the contrary, 'from henceforth he is expecting' till this last enemy shall be destroyed. When last he appeared before his Church to close the visions of

futurity, the character which he selected for the occasion was, 'he that hath the keys of the invisible world, and of death.' This is the capacity in which he will next greet the eyes of the redeemed; meanwhile, he is training them to raise, in concert with himself, this shout over the last of their foes, 'O Death! where thy sting? O Grave! where is thy victory?'"*

*"The Great Teacher," pp. 233–6.

—o—

FROM APPENDIX TO MR. HAM'S LECTURES ON LIFE AND DEATH.

THE VALUE OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY IN SCRIPTURAL SCIENCE.

The speculations of human philosophy I have designedly excluded from these lectures, considering them rather as impediments than aids to the acquisition of the truth on the subjects here discussed. "What is the chaff to the wheat?"

But since, however, it is even still the practice with many Christian theologians to justify their acceptance of the doctrine of the soul's immortality by appeals to the ancient philosophers; and since, moreover, the opinions of these ancient philosophers are cited as of unquestionable authority, it may enable the reader to form a correct judgment of their value, to bring under his notice the following competent and decisive testimonies.

The learned Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, observes:

"As however even the faintest conjecture of a future existence, though it must not be confounded with a full assurance of it, is, as far as it goes, an approximation towards the knowledge of truth, so also notions considerably incorrect respecting that existence, if they are but such as to involve the idea of enjoyment or suffering, corresponding with men's conduct in this life, have so far something of a just foundation, and of a tendency to practical utility. This, however, appears by no means to have been the case with the systems of any, as far as we can learn, of those ancient philosophers who contended the most strenuously for the immortality of the soul. For not only do they seem to have agreed, that no suffering could be expected by the wicked in another life, on the ground that the gods were incapable of anger, and therefore could not punish; but the very notion of the soul's immortality, as explained by them, *involved the complete destruction of distinct personal existence.* Their notion was, (I mean when they spoke their real sentiments; for in their exoteric or popular works they often inculcate for the benefit of the vulgar the doctrine of future retribution, which they elsewhere laugh at,) that the soul of each man is a portion of that Spirit which pervades the universe, to which it is reunited at death, and becomes again an undistinguishable part of the great whole; just as the body is resolved into the general mass of matter. So that their immortality, or rather eternity, of the soul was anterior, as well as posterior; as it was to have no end, so it had no beginning; and the boasted continuance of existence, which according to this system we are to expect after death, consists in returning to the *state in which we were before birth;* which every one must perceive is the same thing, virtually, with annihilation.

"Let it be remembered, then, when the arguments of the heathen sages are triumphantly brought forward in proof of the soul's immortality, that when they countenanced the doctrine of future retribution, they taught with a view to political expediency, what they did not themselves believe; and that when they spoke their real sentiments on the subject, the eternity of existence which they expected, as it implied the destruction of all distinct personality, amounted practically to nothing at all."—*Revelation of a Future State*, sect. v.

"If, after all, it be said that the heathens did come to the knowledge of God, a religious behaviour towards him, the immortality of the soul, &c., and that by the light of nature and unassisted reason only, without any help or instruction but their own ratiocinations, by observation, collection, and inference from sensible objects; a point that many are willing to believe, and to persuade others; I might as justly answer that they never did come to any tolerably adequate conceptions of the Supreme Being, much less of his will, or that worship which must be due to him; nor of the immortality of the soul, or a future state: that it is almost impossible to recount the many impious and false opinions they conceived of the Deity, &c.

"What their notions and doctrines were on theology, and how far their so much boasted philosophy conducted to the knowledge of these important truths, or to the final good and end of man:" our author proposes to, and does fully examine, so "that we may the better judge how far nature and reason are sufficient for these things; for if they did not direct the heathens, neither can they others; and if the former knew not God, nor worshipped him as God, all the shining scraps and quotations cited from them, will be no more than empty, big, swelling words, without any truth or meaning.

"If, among all the writings of the heathen would, notwithstanding so many glittering sentences and almost divine discourses, there cannot be extracted any tolerably explicit system of God, his providence, attributes, and will, the immortality of the soul, or a future state; but in every important point there were horrid defects, and monstrous errors, no agreement or certainty amongst them, some affirming, some denying, others doubting; in all places shocking and impious principles, together with the vilest practices, allowed and tolerated, contrary both to nature and reason; the conclusion must be, that natural light was insufficient to divine knowledge."—*Ellis' Knowledge of Divine Things.* pp. 380. 381.

Among modern authors who have labored to prove the immortality of the soul by a process of rational argumentation, Mr. Samuel Drew must unquestionably be ranked as occupying a foremost position. His essay on the Immateriality and Immortality of the Human Soul, founded solely on physical and rational principles, is an elaborate metaphysical argument altogether independent of revelation. He emphatically deprecates any supposed disrespect to the word of God in assuming this ground which he was led to adopt in the belief that the human reason can furnish an independent argument confirmatory of what he supposes to be a doctrine of revelation—and which, therefore, might be of some service to those sceptical persons who resist the testimony of the sacred writings. As a composition, the essay of Mr. Drew displays remarkable intellectual acumen, and may serve as a monument of his literary fame; but as an argument, like all its predecessors in ancient and modern times, it is unsuccessful. Cicero's ecstatic rapture on the soul's permanence after death, thus coldly terminates: "If after all, I am mistaken in my belief of the soul's immortality, I am pleased with my error."—*De Senect.* And with respect to the arguments of Plato, he says:

"I have perused Plato with the greatest diligence and exactness, over and over again; but know not how it is, whilst I read him I am convinced, when I lay the book aside and begin to consider by myself of the soul's immortality, *all the conviction instantly ceases.*"—*Tusc. Q.* lib. 1. What Cicero said of Plato must also be said by the intelligent and most pains-taking reader of Drew. There is no well-defined data sufficient to form the basis of a superstructure of pure reason which shall demonstrate the soul's immortality. What do we know of the nature and essential properties of matter that we should affirm, that no mere material organization is adequate to the production of the conscious thinking principle? It is true that *we* are not acquainted with any combination of matter or means of combining matter which do, or shall secure such a result; but shall we conclude that because *our* experience and ability cannot furnish us with an illustration, therefore there *is* no illustration? It has yet to be proved that *man* is not such an illustration of consciousness resulting from material organization. Let it be granted, however, for argument's sake, that matter is incapable in any combination of evolving consciousness and thought, does it follow of necessity that the conscious or thinking principle is *not matter—immaterial?* If this is sound logic then the following argument stands good; it is affirmed of matter that it is *indestructible* because capable of divisibility—then what is *not matter*, or *immaterial*, is *destructible*, for the reason as in the former case that it is *opposite.* The argument is this: matter *cannot* think, therefore what is *not* matter *can* think. For the same reason since matter is *indestructible*, therefore what is *not* matter is *destructible.* But it is an important step in the proof of the soul's immortality in the argument from reason, that the soul is *immaterial.* It is immortal, say our metaphysicians, because it is *immaterial;* while on their own principle of reasoning, the *immateriality* of the soul is the proof of its *destructibility* or *mortality!*

Cicero affirms, that a pure mind, thinking, intelligent, and free from body, was altogether inconceivable; and with a feeling bordering on despair, says:—"Which of all the philosophic opinions is true, let some god see to it; which even is most likely to be true, is a question hard to be determined."—*Tusc. Q.* lib. 1.

The immortality of the soul is a human conceit reared upon the rotten foundation of mere conjectures and assumptions. A sound philosophical inquiry into the phenomenon of our being will ever end in the humble and pious admiration of the Psalmist, "I will praise Thee, *for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.*"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL VII. NEW YORK, JULY, 1852. NO. 7

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton Street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

[For the Bible Examiner.]

AN EARLY RESURRECTION PROMISED TO MESSIAH.

BY WILLIAM GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

"For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

In the second chapter of Acts, the Apostle Peter, in his memorable sermon, applies the prediction, of which the above verse forms a part, to Messiah, the exalted Saviour of the world. No time, therefore, need be occupied in determining for whom were the words in the text provided, or who was not to be left in hell, what Holy One was not to see corruption, since a more satisfactory explanation could not be desired by any reasonable mind than the one contained in the discourse referred to. At once, then, we may proceed to their exposition, and, by the help of God, endeavor to open up their meaning with clearness and as much brevity as is consistent with a proper development of their contents.

I. Observe, the text is a reason for the feelings and hope expressed in the preceding verse. "My heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope." Why? "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," &c. The whole passage may be thrown into the promise form and read thus: "Thy," says Jehovah to his Messiah, "thy heart shall be glad, and thy glory shall rejoice; thy flesh also shall rest in hope, for thy soul will not be left in hell, thou wilt not be suffered to see corruption." Such was the prophetic promise prepared for Messiah, and trusting to the faithfulness of his Father, in due time he took it up, we doubt not, in faith, and made it his consolation while advancing toward the cross and the tomb. Then it assumed the form expressive of Messiah's unwavering confidence in it as a faithful saying, and this, in anticipation of his certainly employing it so as to express his conviction of its truth, is the shape it has in the prophetic record, "My heart *is* glad, and my glory *rejoiceth*; my flesh also *shall rest in hope*, for thou *wilt not leave* my soul," &c.

II. "My soul" (*napheshi*) is a Hebrewism for *me*. Thou wilt not leave *me* in hell, is the form of the language when divested of its Oriental idiom. Of such a mode of expressing the idea of *personality*, there are a multitude of examples in the Old and New Testament. For instance: Gen. 34: 8. "The soul of my son Schechem," i. e., *my son* Schechem. Ps. 34: 22, "The Lord redeemeth the soul of his servants," i. e., the Lord redeemeth *his servants*. Prov. 10: 3, "The Lord will not suffer the soul of the righteous to famish," i. e., the Lord will not suffer *the righteous* to famish. Ezek. 18: 4, "All souls are mine, as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is mine, the soul that sinneth it shall die;" or simply thus: "All are mine, as the Father, so also the Son is mine, he that sinneth shall die."

Not unfrequently have our translators omitted the *nephesh*, commonly rendered soul, and given a simple utterance of its force, or the idea of personality, as we have done after the scripture quotations just made. In illustration of this statement, we may refer to such passages as these: Gen. 14: 21, "And the King of Sodom said unto Abraham, give me the persons," (margin, "*souls.*") Josh. 23: 11, "Take good heed, therefore, unto yourselves," (margin, *your souls.*) Judges 16: 30, "And Samson said, let me die," (margin, let *my soul* die.) 1 Chron. 5: 21, "And they took —— of men an hundred thousand," (margin, they took of "*soule of men.*") Job. 36: 14, "They die in youth," (margin, *their soul dieth.*) Jer. 37: 9, "Deceive not yourselves," (marg., *your souls.*) 2 Cor. 12: 15, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you," (marg., *your souls.*)

"Thou wilt not leave *my soul*," then, is clearly *me*, or thou wilt not leave *thy Messiah* in hell, &c. As the verse is constructed on the parallel principle, which is often illustrated by the Hebrew poems, it is also apparent that there is in the second division of the passage some terms that repeat and explain certain words in the first. The terms in the first member of the verse we allude to, are "my soul," and the words that are parallel to them are clearly 'thine Holy One;' and since this is the case, we may read the verse thus: "Thou wilt not leave me, thy Holy One, in hell, thou wilt not suffer me, thine Holy One, to see corruption." The soul of Jehovah's Holy One just means Jehovah's Holy One himself, who was not to remain in hell, who was not to see corruption. Likewise, let it be remarked, that the second form, "thine Holy One," not merely parallels the first "my soul" or me, but adds to its fulness by way of explanation, or by disclosing the perfection of Messiah's character. He is not merely Jehovah's One—the one dear to him; he is his "Holy One," which manifests the Redeemer's character and faithfulness in his office as the revealer of God and the Saviour of men. Viewing the text as a promise, the form in which it would originally exist in the Divine mind, and would be thrown upon the intellect of the prophet, into which shape we have already converted it above, "thy heart shall be glad—thy glory shall rejoice—thy soul shall not be left in hell—neither shall thou see corruption"—it contains a Divine testimony to the character of Messiah as the "Holy One;" and hence when he applies the designation to himself, he simply used the terms that were provided for him; his Father styles him his "Holy One," and therefore he so describes himself, and tacitly, as we may say, employs the acknowledged fact as a plea why the promise should be realised in his experience. In the character of the Messiah, the epithet "Holy One" was perfectly illustrated, for he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" spotless was his life, and in the end, even Judas, who was most intimately acquainted with him, who had been, as we say, admitted behind the

cenes, had no other declaration than this concerning his Master whom he betrayed, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." It would appear then that the phrase "Holy One" is not to be understood of comparative perfection in character; on the contrary, it unquestionably denotes absolute completeness, holiness, or wholeness in him who appeared as the example and redeemer of our race. He towered above all human beings as the cloud-touching mountain rises above the plain and its hills and palms. He was that beloved Son in whom his Father was well pleased, as was intimated by voices from the eternal throne, by the intense and incomprehensibly intimate fellowship he enjoyed with his Father, by the astonishing prodigies at this crucifixion, by his resurrection from the grave, and his exaltation to the right hand of the Majesty on high, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named. In virtue of his sinlessness could he die for the unjust; in virtue of needing no salvation himself, could he become the Redeemer of a lost world.

III. His soul, he, the "Holy One" of God, was not to be left in hell, neither was he to see corruption.

The term rendered "hell" is *sheol* in the Hebrew, and in applying this prediction to Jesus Christ, and demonstrating its accomplishment in him, the Apostle Peter uses *hadou*, a part of the Greek work *hades*, which is proven by this very fact to be the Greek synonym for the Hebrew *sheol*. Sheol signifies the state of the dead, or a dead state, the grave, a deep pit. Frequently is it rendered grave in the Old Testament, as Ps. 6: 5, "In the grave (sheol) who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. 30: 3, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul (or *me*) from the grave," (sheol.) Ps. 31: 17, "Let them (the wicked) be silent as the grave," (sheol.) Ps. 89: 48, "Shall he deliver his soul (himself) from the hand of the grave," (sheol.) Prov. 1: 12, "Let us swallow them up alive in the grave," (sheol.) Prov. 30: 16, "The grave," (sheol.) Eccl. 9: 10, "There is no work, nor device, &c., in the grave, (sheol,) whither thou goest." See also Song of Sol. 8: 6, Isa. 38: 10, and Rev. 20: 13, "Death and hell (*hades*, margin, *grave*,) delivered up the dead which were in them." When a dead man is in *sheol*, he is of course in his grave, but the term *sheol* is more comprehensive or generic than the word grave as usually employed. All the dead are in *sheol*, or in a dead state; hades has the dead, not the living, in it, as is demonstrated by Rev. 20: 13, "Death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them." Each dead man is in his grave, or *keber*, in the Hebrew tongue. Sheol, or hades, clasps all graves—it, like a large realm, receives the congregation of the dead, and in its silent, dark and noisome enclosure they slumber on and moulder into dust. When one goes into sheol, the poetic Hebrew mind pictures him as going into this obscure domain, which is just a *state*, presented under the imagery of a place, for *sheol is no more a real place than death is a real being*. They personified death as we do ourselves when for instance we speak of the monster death, of his coming, of his relentlessness, meaning only thereby that men expire under an unavoidable appointment; the dead go into sheol—they are with the dead—they are like them—they are asleep and corrupting in the dust. Inasmuch as dead men are buried or covered over from the sight, it is quite correct to say of all the dead that they are in *hell* even, only let the true force of the English term be carefully understood. Hell is a part "of the Anglo-Saxon verb *helan*, 'to hele,' or hell, heel, hill, shell, hulk, shovel, whole, wold, welt, heal, sheal, shield, shawl, i. e., 'cover up.'"* Hell, then, is a place covered up, and when men are in *sheol*, they are hidden from view; they are, as the Greeks said, in *hades*, the unseen, from *a*, not, and *idein*, to see. The import of hell is very perceptible in the word healing. When a wound is closing, we say it is healing; when fully repaired, we say it has healed, it is now covered out of view. Thus it is quite correct to call each grave a hell, for there a corpse is hid, so that hell may stand generically for all graves and for the state of all in them, or specifically for a grave, and the state of the dead being by whom it is tenanted. Do we not speak of *a grave*, and of *the grave?* So we may discourse of hell and of a hell, (hole is twin to hell;) of sheol, and of a sheol, though the Hebrews never seem to have used the term except in a generic or comprehensive manner, (as we use the word grave in the expression *the grave*,) though the principles of language might fully have authorised them taking such a course.

When Messiah entered sheol, he was hid, silent, praiseless and at rest; he was in the state and of course in the place where corruption is seen or undergone. Now this brings us to note the second parallelism that seems to be in the verse. The first was between the "my soul" or the *me*, and the "Holy One;" the example remaining to be considered is found in the words "in hell" and "see corruption." Let them be placed thus—

Thou wilt not leave *me* IN HELL;
Neither wilt thou suffer thine *Holy One* to SEE CORRUPTION.

To be in *sheol*, or in the state of the dead, is not necessarily to see corruption; it is, however, certainly to be where in *all ordinary cases* it is seen or undergone, and where no one is long without suffering decomposition. Lazarus, for instance, was in sheol, and he had been so long in a condition of death in the tomb, that his sister thought corruption must at the date of her conversation with our Lord, have had a commencement; she said, "Lord, by this time he stinketh, for he hath been *dead* (buried?) four days." John 11: 39. The soul of Messiah, or Messiah himself, could die then; for he did expire on the cross; could see corruption since he needed to be preserved from it, and the words before us are the promise that he would. Had the verse ran, Thou wilt not suffer me to see *sheol*, the meaning would have been, thou wilt not permit me to die; had it been only, thou wilt not leave me in sheol, the sense would have been, thou wilt give me a resurrection, without at all intimating when it would be effected; and as it stands, we learn that Messiah was to die, for he was to enter sheol, and also that he would be soon resurrected, since he was not in sheol even to see corruption. The whole verse, then, is equivalent to a declaration that Messiah should have a *very early* resurrection; one before corruption had commenced, which in the climate of Judea was commenced much sooner than with us, in consequence of its warmer temperature, which is universally known to accelerate the process of decay and resolution. From the gospels we discover that Messiah expected such a restoration to life, as we read in Matt. 20: 18–19, "The chief priests and —— scribes shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge and to crucify him, and the *third* day he shall rise again." Matt. 12: 40, "For as Jonah was three

*"English Truth-Seeker," No. 5, p. 377.

days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be *three days* and three nights in the heart of the earth." On the morning of the third day, in spite of every effort by his foes, he awoke from the sleep of death, and came forth the spoiler of the grave.

"And did he rise?
Hear, O ye nations, hear it, O ye dead!
He rose, he rose! and burst the bars of death."

From the sepulchre he issued forth to die no more; death has no more dominion over him—he ever liveth to make intercession for us. "With long life"—length of days—"will I satisfy him, and show him my salvation."

IV. We would now suggest a few remarks of a more practical nature, arising out of the preceding statements.

1. Observe how the faithfulness of Jehovah was manifested toward Messiah.

It was more than a thousand years after the promise in the text was first delivered, ere it had its fulfilment, and how exactly and truthfully was it accomplished! The blessed Redeemer trusted, and was not put to shame; his hopes were realized, his predicted triumph was gained. "He was not left in sheol, neither did he see corruption." As the Prince of believers, he sets us an example by his confidence in his Father's testimony—he staggered not at the promises—he was strong in the faith, giving glory to him who had sent him into the world. Thus he was the "Holy One"—pre-eminently the Holy One—who, in virtue of his faith, the fountain of peace and of power, finished the work which had been given him to do. And why should we ever be unbelievers? Why should we ever for a moment dishonor, by our suspicions, the God who cannot lie? We have no less reason to trust the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ than the Saviour himself; he trusted, took his Father at his simple word—and is that word less real, less true to us than it was to him? Has not the Father of All one character—the changeless in love and faithfulness? Let us then learn to be loyal subjects and bold believers; act on the conviction in our journey through life, amid its cares and wants, and sorrows and toils, and fears and foes, that "heaven and earth may pass away," but one promise towards us who are his sons, by a gracious birth, shall not pass away, or come short of the millionth part of a line of its perfect and literal accomplishment. With thine eye, O my brother, scan the future, studied with star-promises each of them vocal telling thee of transcendent glories, of unfading joys, and listen with an expanded ear, for the voice that speaks is the voice of God!

2. Observe, the blessed Jesus can sympathize with us in life and in death. Had he only lived for a while below, in toil and sorrow, and then departed say from Gethsemane to heaven, he would have had no experience of death, and of course less ability to sympathize with his friends when entering the valley of shadows, and in their aversion from the silence and corruption toward which it conducts. But he so lived and also died; he can therefore feel for the living, and for the dying. In what situation can we be placed of which he had not experience in the days of his flesh, while he was a pilgrim through the vale of tears? Once he was young, and with the 'lambs' he has a fellow-feeling; so with the tried, so with the bereaved, so with the poor, so with the persecuted, so with the betrayed and calumniated, and so with the dying in their mortal pangs. We are nearly ignorant of his celestial joys, yet he knows well our terrestrial experiences. We cannot apprehend his glory, but he knows right well our gloom. Truly, he is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and is not merely impressed and moved by them, but can yield us from his vast stores those measures of consolation and fortitude which we require. Having passed through the stages of our common humanity, and had trials beyond all we will ever be called upon to endure—having climbed the mountains and trod the valleys—having seen night starry and starless—having groaned in death and entered the thick darkness of sheol, he is competent in every sense to be a present help in the hour of need.

3. Observe, that through the fulfillment of this promise to Messiah, he has become the first fruits of them that slept. Had he not descended to the grave, and triumphed over death, there would have been for us no joy, no hope of a return from the land of sheol, to the activity of conscious being. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain—and they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," it is all over with them for ever—the eye-lids of the grave are eternally closed. But he who died for us, has risen again, and life and immortality have been brought sensibly to light by his reanimated and glorified existence. His holy ones, who have been washed in his blood and made meet for a sublimer destiny, will yet awake from the repose of death. Yet see on yonder side the tomb, the king in his beauty, and the kingdom over which he is to reign. Unless he speedily returns to earth, the reader and writer will enter into Sheol, and return to dust, like the companies who have already been gathered to their fathers; the dominion of death over us, however, shall not be perpetual, and if we have in this life sought for "glory, and honor, and immortality," this mortal shall be exchanged for immortality and this corruptible for incorruption. Rather would we like Paul, have "mortality swallowed up of life." and thereby be saved the necessity of entering the dark portals and the halls of oblivion; we can only be there, however, for a time, and, thanks be unto God who giveth us the hope of emancipation from the bondage of the sepulchre. The sleep, however long it may last, will appear but a momentary dream; the blaze of immortality will seem instantly to have followed the blow of death. We shall not be left in Sheol, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it, and the glorified Immanuel, our Divine Brother, is the pledge and model and power of our own resurrection.

Finally. Never let us forget that in the resurrecting of Jesus, there was shown the divine immense compassion for our race. God so loved the world that he devoted to death for us his only begotten Son, that through his dying, death might be destroyed, and that we might escape the destruction which sin entails. For ages the hymn of love divine has been composing, and the drama of infinite compassion enacting before this world and the universe. What a scene was developed in Eden, what thrilling promises had fallen on the ears of ancient prophets and saints; what a forthcoming was shown in the manger, and on the accursed tree; what an unrollment when the tomb of Joseph was emptied, and what a transcendent and enduring vision will be unveiled when we shall be like him, seeing him as he is! Call it all the song, the poem, the labor of divine compassion for man, designed to attract the eye of the thoughtless, to move the affections of the torpid, to quicken and elevate the morally degraded. We can only by viewing it in different lights and from various positions, see its vastness, discover it

as the shoreless incomprehensible. God with man, for man, in view of man, and in man! Love producing being, and consuming sin; love saving being and confronting death, and Sheal with threatening that will soon be summarily executed. This love, O reader! is thy God, for God, the author of thy being, is love. Over thee he watches from hour to hour with a parent's solicitude, and on account of thy sins, if still thou are rebellious, he is moved in sorrow; even for thy return he longs with ardour, and will rejoice to clasp thee instantly to his bosom. He is now in Christ wishing, not that thou mayest endeavor to reconcile him, but that thou wouldest be reconciled to thy God. "Be *ye* reconciled unto God." Be ye—*ye*—O sinner, be ye reconciled unto Him. Amen.

UNIVERSALISM.

In the January and February numbers of the Examiner, we gave an article from Mrs. C. C. Williams, of Elmira, N. Y., on Universalism. That article was sent first to the Editor of the Ambassader, a Universalist paper, and returned with the following note declining its publication:

MRS. CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS—

Dear Madam: It is seldom I am compelled to decline the publication of a communication with so much regret, as in returning the accompanying article from your pen. Its spirit of candor, and kindness, I can highly commend, and treats the denomination to which I belong, with a friendliness greatly in contrast with the spirit manifested by many other sects. It shows an investigating mind greatly to your credit, and that you have given yourself much to the study of the Scriptures. Alas! that with all your reading, you should yet fail to see the most momentous and beautiful truths, which that Book of Books declares in relation to man's final destiny. There are several reasons which bear against an insertion of your article in the Ambassador.

1st. It is very lengthy—much more so than articles should be, which are intended for a weekly paper. The very length would frighten many away from its perusal. See the present crowded state of our columns; it would be many weeks, if not months, before I could find an opportunity to insert it, with any justice to matters already on hand and pressing for publication.

2d. Although your article is grammatically constructed and properly punctual, yet before it could be placed in the hands of the printer (there are many little corrections known only to those who are familiar to the mechanical process of type-setting) which would have to be made, to have it appear as it should in print. I could explain these technicalities better orally than I can describe them with the pen. Pressed as I am, to an extreme degree, with the labors required of me, this would be a task I could find little time to fulfil.

3d. Although your communication professed to be an answer to Mr. Ballou's Convention Sermon, yet you make very little reference to it, and do not attempt directly to invalidate any of its positions, by showing their inconsistency, except by endeavoring to build up a conflicting theory. The article, in fact, is a labored and studied essay in support of the doctrine of *annihilation* rather than a review of Mr. Ballou's sermon.

4th. If the communication were admitted, an answer would be required at my hands. This would lead to a long, and I apprehend, profitless discussion between us. You have quoted, I should judge, over one hundred passages of Scripture. Two-thirds of them at least, I deem entirely misapplied. Yet to go through them, one by one, and show their irrelevancy, would be an amount of manual labor, which would require many days to accomplish. For instance, you construe the phrase "death unto death," in 2 Cor. 2 16, as signifying natural death resolved into *eternal death!* a phrase of which the Scripture writers never once made use.

I rejoice that you have turned away from the cruel dogma of an *endless life* in *endless agonies*. It shows your native goodness of heart. But I regret that you halted by the way to adopt the chilling and unsatisfactory theory of *annihilation*. The idea that God, after having created man "subject to vanity," should in consequence of his blindness and frailty in this existence, strike him into non-entity in another world, rather than train him up to perfection and glory—is to me exceedingly unscriptural, unreasonable and repulsive. Your *heart* certainly desires a better view of human destiny—it desires in fact, precisely what we preach, the hope that all at last shall be brought to obedience and love. If you will pursue your investigations with a sincere desire to know the whole truth, and with your mind unprejudiced by preconceived opinions, I have no doubt the convictions of your reason will, in due time, fully accord with the better promptings of your heart.

Imploring the divine blessing to rest upon you, and aid you in your researches for truth, I subscribe myself

Your friend and brother,

J. M. AUSTIN.

MRS. WILLIAMS' REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

Mr. J. M. Austin—Sir: I received my article accompanied by your respectful and fraternal letter, some time since, and I desire again to crave your indulgence to a few things I wish to say in reply in the order of your letter. I was neither disappointed nor offended at the non-insertion of my article, as a desire to be noticed, I trust, formed no part of my motive for writing, consequently vanity had no chance to be mortified. However, I should like to see the points on which I wrote treated on. I am thankful you received it in the spirit it was written. But alas, if, in studying the Scriptures, no such reward is to crown our toil, which we may dare trust, as cheers the inquirer on in any and every other department of knowledge, viz: the sun-light of truth—the animating conviction that we understand the Author. Everything else has an A. B. C. process that needs to be gone through with, so that any one under a good teacher to lead, and thoroughly explain first principles, can, after a time arrive at pleasing certainty, and all understand alike. Is it not as important that the Biblical student should have *the key?* If in one case, much process would be impossible without a knowledge of first principles, why not in the other? Some ancients, Acts 13, 26-7 read the Scriptures every *Sabbath*, but understood not. Pursuing that course now, would undoubtedly lead to the same result. Must there not be some serious defect somewhere to occasion such a diversity of sentiment? You speak with regret that I should yet fail to see what you say is declared in the Bible, in relation to man's final destiny. If you are right, I am wrong, that is certain, and in case you are right, I would like to speak world-wide, that some one might answer, and point out a way to

surmount the obstacles that beset me, in attempting to scale the eminence on which you stand, which commands such a view as you take of God, his government and designs, respecting those who live and die slaves to vice and every species of degrading sensuality by making them co-sharers and participators in those pure delights which many, or some, in all ages of the world have thought could only be obtained by "denying ungodliness and worldly lust, and living soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil-world." When I believed in eternal misery, I was constantly harrassed by conflicting emotions, I could explain nothing—solve nothing—mystery all. When I turned to Universalism for relief, I was equally puzzled, though quite differently. Jesus' mission as explained by John, would force itself before me. There it was, and is, and I have never yet seen the difficulty removed. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John 3, 14, 15. Perishing in opposition to eternal life. I try to place myself in your case, and look at it and ask myself, has Jesus' death effected anything? and I am forced to say I can't see as it has, for what death is now, it must ever have been, and if it is now "another life," introducing all into a "better and lovelier state," it must all who have left the stage heretofore, and this would have been the case if Jesus had not died, for neither man's nature nor death are changed thereby. But in searching the Scriptures for a confirmation of such a view, I find what appears quite different. The Bible seems to speak of man's perishing as it does of beasts, and I see nothing whereby I can discriminate between the death of the wicked and the beasts—for example, "all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of lives, (Gen. 7: 22, margin) died, while those only who were in the ark, were left alive. The cities of the plain, or the people became so steeped in sensuality, as to be unfit to stand longer, and Peter speaks of these instances as something awful, and says they are ensamples to those who should after live ungodly. 2 Pet. 2, 5–6. Again the inhabitants of Canaan were spued out as too vile for the earth to longer bear them, (Lev. 18: 27–9,) and they were destroyed, that they might not be a snare to the Israelites, on the principle "that one sinner destroys much good." We too, pull up weeds that good may grow. The Israelites were threatened with a like fate if they did thus. Now, however much is threatened them, or any one else, it all seems nullified, and what the Bible calls great calamities, seems the height of blessing, if death is what your paper claims, and any means that brings about so desirable a result as an introduction into a state of perfect good, should be hailed with gladness rather than with "fear and dread."

There is one fact worthy of observation which I do not remember to have seen much noticed by your writers, viz: the Apostles based all their hopes on *promises* made to the fathers, and I cannot remember ever to have seen any promise of *eternal life* to the wicked on which to build; on the contrary, the Old Testament abounds with threatenings of destruction to the wicked on the one hand, and promises of life to the righteous on the other. See the 37th and 49th Psalms in particular. I go on to the New, and hear the *Great Teacher* say, "good were it for that man by whom offences come, if he had never been born;" (Mat. 18: 7.) and hear him propose this question for solution, "what is a man, *any man* advantaged if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?" Luke 9: 25. With all this array, and much more which I might bring (so plain if we understand it, as we understand each other in talking thus about any thing else,) how can I explain? How do you explain it, so as to venture to draw inferences from other passages directly contrary to express declarations, respecting those who do not "confess their sins and forsake them?" However much those passages seem to favor something else, that might be so if other things correspond. Can the end of the wicked be destruction, death, perishing, &c., and eternal life? We know that the major part of those belonging to the species called man, die with little more regrets for the past, and I might add, hopes for the future, that the "beasts that perish," and the descriptions given of the future state, forbids the idea of penitents there. Mat. 22: 30. Mark 12: 15. Luke 20: 36. If they do not sin because of the absence of temptation, I shall not envy them their happiness. But the language of the Bible seems to be, if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye, through the spirit mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live, (Rom. 8: 3,) and I cannot see why man should be entitled to so much more regard than the rest of his creatures, unless he is distinguished from them in some other way than form. If God thinks they are not fit to live here, I cannot see how they can be fit to live with angels in Heaven, or be made so just by dying. The above are a few of the things that puzzle me, and I am not alone. Among the thinking who oppose your views—hostility arises more from these things, than the humiliating tendency of your doctrines. Reconciling these things would be doing away great obstacles if it can be done. Too many put raillery and declamation in the room of argument, but truth needs no such supports, and I will say, I mistake you if you are of that class.

Your first and second objections to publishing my article were valid. Your third seems not so well based. I plead guilty to your charge in part. I I considered it enough if the Scripture writers were on my side, for if I proved my side right, it must inevitably invalidate Mr. Ballou's sermon, for both cannot be true. If the remanding back to the nonentity from whence all sprung, those whom God shall deem "cumberers of the ground," no more to see life, (John 3: 36,) is *annihilation*, then that is what I understand the united testimony of the Scripture writers prove. That no knowledge is gained without mental toil, I readily grant, but it is not so *hard* to tell what I think, I understand.

4th. Though I am anxious to see the subject of life and death discussed, but not anxious to become a public disputant, yet it is not strange that you should deem such a discussion fruitless, while with me life is at stake, with you the most any one can lose or fail of, is a good conscience—the pleasing sense of doing right. Though the enjoyment of these is so desirable, yet the current of selfishness, which needs stemming in order to enjoy them, seems too formidable to be attempted, on reflecting that by drifting with the current, we may reach the desired heaven sooner—when death will at once strip our low-lived propensities from us, leaving nothing to do even for the vilest, but to regret the past, perhaps, or else become at once a pure angel, and begin at once to enjoy that which never cost one act of self-denial to win. So that however much I admire your percepts, (for they are beautiful) your strongest arguments and most powerful appeals to become and

live like the adored *Nazarene*, seem motiveless and nullified in view of the result, which theoretically and virtually promises most to the most undeserving. You deem two-thirds of the passages I quoted, misapplied. If it is so, it is because I misapprehended. I believe in understanding the Scriptures as we understand anything else we take interest enough in to study, till assured by the light and a mutual feeling, or the witness of the spirit of truth that we understand the author, even as we know when we understand, and are understood in conversation or correspondence. Though we know in these, we sometimes misunderstand for a time—and the same is undoubtedly true in the other case. But I try to study, compare, and carefully weigh everything I undertake to fathom—to understand the reasons the writers themselves give for their assertion, nor feel at liberty to assign different ones, as it seems to me you do in several instances. Thus in the passage, and I, if I be lifted up, &c., I see nothing in the reason John gives, for Jesus saying so to warrant such an application of it, as your writers make. And Paul too, gives his reason why "God wills all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," and in the reason he assigns, I see nothing more than that Jesus, in his office as mediator, (inasmueh as "he gave himself a ransom for all,") is ready to undertake, in behalf of any one who sues to him, irrespectively and impartially, thereby recognizing man as capable of acting a rational part in the transaction. Once more—where the Apostles speak of the restitution of all things that the prophets have foretold should be restored, I see it used as though it meant all would finally be holy and happy. But does not restore mean, to give back something before possessed. They had formerly enjoyed independence, a king, and kingdom of their own, and the question anxiously asked Jesus prior to his ascension, shows the nature of their hopes as to what they expected to be restored again. Lord wilt thou at *this time* restore again the kingdom to Israel? Acts 1: 6. Now I do not take your frankness unkindly, and may mine not offend you. It will lead me to greater caution, I trust. You say "eternal death is a phrase never used in Scripture. Admitting it, though we have a translation of the New Testament, by Harwood, which (in Mat. 25: 46) reads, "the wicked will then be sentenced to eternal death;" still aside from this, if you should introduce a contrast about anything, and use a qualifiing term in one case, and for brevities sake omit it in its opposite, especially if your meaning was apparent and unmistakeable, would you not consider it unfair to make a handle of it to destroy the contrast? Please examine John 6, Rom. 2, and 1 John 5, in particular, and judge if it is perversion, to qualify both antetheses alike.

Lastly, though you regret that I have halted by the way, yet am I not justified? Is it, or can it be satisfactory to believe what we cannot reconcile? It is a sad thing to die and live no more, and my heart beats in unison with the divine sympathy speaking through the prophet when he says, "I rather they would turn and live;" but my sympathy is not of that kind that would spare the viper to spread death around. I will do what I can to win to virtue, and let God be judge, as to who are, and who are not fit to live, leaving vengeance to him to whom it belongs." But to me it seems like bidding a bounty on sin, to plead man's "ignorance and frailty" as an excuse for his sensuality, unless we first satisfy ourselves that he has not endowed man sufficiently to fulfil his part, and then exacts of him that he cannot perform. That there are those but little removed from the brutes, is undeniable, and if God is alone chargeable for their being thus, it would not seem altogether unreasonable that he should take them to himself, and train them, instead of leaving so hopeless a task to his blinded creatures. Our *own consciousness* however tells us we do as we please, nor do we act without motive, and what greater motive can be brought to bear on us than a chance to "lay hold on eternal life." What an incentive is this to continue patiently in well doing and self-denial! And does not frail man need such an inducement to fortify him sufficiently against the strong tide of passions which engulfs so many? Would it not have a more elevating tendency on mankind to appeal to the noble powers they possess to control themselves, rather than to tell them God is too good to attach any lasting consequences to the life-indulgence of their lower natures. Let us rather say, with David—"if thou seek him, he will be found of thee, but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." I can anticipate little pleasure in spending eternity with those who have no sympathy for nought but sensual delights here, without some guarantee for their future good conduct, and on the Saviour's principle I see none, for he says if we are not faithful in a little, we shall not be in much, and it seems too much to me to think of such mighty interests being entrusted to those who hitherto betrayed every trust, and with whom virtue, purity, and everything good, were ever in jeopardy. What though a ray of goodness now and then beams, as there does from the worst, are we willing to trust such far? "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Such society I pant after and long for, and I can see neither partiality nor injustice in awarding life to those who prove themselves worthy of it, and death to those who, like the lower animals prefer a life of self-indulgence. 2 Pet. 2: 12. And because some avail themselves of the blessings which the Son of God died to secure, I cannot see as it makes the case of those who do not any worse, than it would have been if no such plan had been devised and executed, and thereby all after passing a short life here had returned again to their dust to live no more. I have written more than I meant to, but not half I want to, but I forbear. This is the way things appear to me, and I cannot reconcile them with your belief. If your views on these things were as rational and consistent as your talk about the unity of God, I should have no trouble to see. But waiving every other objection, if you can prove that all are naturally immortal, or that any will ever become so but those "who by a patient continuance in well doing seek for it, (Rom. 2: 7.) then I shall not be slow to believe that eternal life awaits *entire humanity*, and then hope will be resolved into certainty, and anxiety will cease, for I have long been convinced from the Bible, that an immortal being can neither sin, suffer, nor die. With the best wishes, a grateful acknowledgment of your generous expressions of interest in a *stranger*, and a reciprocation of your title of brother, I close by subscribing myself,

Yours, with much respect,

C. C. Williams.

AN ORGANIZATION.

Lewiston Falls, Me., 31st March, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—It devolves on me to address you on the part of a small band of Brethren in the Faith, inhabitants of this village, who have recently united

together for mutual benefit, by means of conference and prayer. For some time back we had had desultory conversations, meeting only as it happened, and never all together. On the evening of Tuesday, the ninth of March instant—a day agreed on after frequent contemplation of such a course—we met for the first time *formally*, to deliberate on the subject of such mutual aid, and to take measures for holding regular weekly conferences.

On this interesting occasion, the brethren consulted together respecting the *Rule of Faith* to be established among us. One brother referred us to the practice of the oldest of the Baptist Chnrches in New England—the Church of Roger Williams—which has never established or used any other test, in admitting members, but the Bible; and has never had any other book of doctrine or articles of faith. Many others of the Baptist Churches, (it was observed,) are said to have pursued the same course.

Another brother argued, that we are now setting out—a small band—and it is important that we should set out *right*, and strike a *right line* for our course. Other ecclesiastical bodies at their outset, have struck a line which they intended should be straight and parallel with the straight line of the course of the Apostles of the lamb. They have gone on well awhile: but, after a long while, have found themselves at some distance from the true line. Some take in the Fathers of the Church as part of the Rule of Faith. These fathers were but *men*, and liable to err. By-and-bye, those who follow them are found to have diverged, more or less, from the *true line* with which they had supposed their course to be parallel. But if we strike the true line at the outset, we shall be enabled to keep the right course. It is absolutely necessary, in order to avoid the danger of diverging, that instead of creeds, we should adopt the unerring rule of the *revealed First Principles of Truth*; and it was

"*Unanimously Resolved*, That we adopt, as the sole Guide and Rule of our Faith and practice, the *Bible*, the *whole Bible*, and *nothing but the Bible*."

On Wednesday evening, the seventeenth instant, at our second conference, we took into consideration the propriety of adopting a *name* for our society; and also the expediency of corresponding with brethren in other places, on the doctrines of the Bible, and on all matters in general, connected with the pure faith of the Gospel, and especially, (on the present occasion,) in respect to the question of a *suitable designation*, for all societies of believers who hold with us on essential points, and on such as distinguish us: which latter may be described as the belief:

Firstly. That *man* was *created mortal*; and was placed on probation for *immortality*.

Secondly. That to fallen man, *immortality* is now offered *in* and *through Jesus Christ* alone.

And thirdly. That *he* that *hath not* the *Son of God, hath not Life*; that *he* that *believeth not* the *Son, shall not see life*, but those who *obey not* the Gospel, will be *punished with everlasting destruction*.

The general sentiment (as entered on our record,) was—that while some distinctive appellation is not only desirable, but necessary—(it being indeed *inevitable* that some sort of name would be given to us if we should not in the first place assume one,)—it is, at the same time important to avoid everything like a *sectarian designation*. Upon deliberation, the conclusion was arrived at, that it is essential to the propriety of a name to be chosen on such an occasion, that it shall indicate and express that the Association is based on the broad and sure foundation of evangelical general principles; and it was

"*Unanimously Resolved*, That we adopt for our Association, thus instituted for the purpose of meetings for conference and prayer, the name of '*The Reformed Protestant Society of Lewiston Falls, Maine.*'"

It was then ordered, "that the secretary correspond with Bro. George Storrs and others, introducing us as a society, to their notice; and requesting interchange of brotherly communications, particularly on the subject of the name which we have adopted."

It is part of my duty to add, that it has been a frequent topic of remark among us, that it is desirable to obtain information respecting the degree to which our views of evangelical doctrines are now diffused among the churches in Britain as well as in America. So soon as we can ascertain the names and residences of leading men engaged in this revived reformation, we shall consult our interests, as well as our feelings, in putting ourselves in direct communication with them. The advantages, we believe, will not be small to us; and if we can contribute even a little to the encouragement of others to go on zealously fighting the Lord's battles, "without fear and without reproach," it will be a most delightful reflection in all coming time.

We find our Conferences profitable. There are, however, as all know, passages of scripture, in the study of which the friendly aid of a brother who is more thoroughly versed in such learning becomes a great desideratum. We read the Bible Examiner with profit and pleasure. And we hope still to continue to find much advantage in its perusal.

Whatever information and advice you can afford us in these matters will be thankfully received.

Yours in haste,

HENRY BALDWIN, Jr.,
R. Sec. Ref. Prot. Society,
Lewiston Falls, Maine.

GEO. STORRS, Editor Bible Examiner.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We have inserted the foregoing, though it does not come altogether within the special object of the Examiner. We are glad these brethren have adopted the "Bible as the sole rule of faith and practice:" that is right; but where in that book do our beloved brethren find a rule for calling themselves by any other name than the "*Church of God*," in Lewiston Falls? We fully approve the *object* these brethren have in view, but not the *name* they have assumed. We think they, on reflection, will see that the Bible does not sanction the followers of Christ in taking any other name than that of God or his Christ. "The Church of God," or "The Church of Christ," as we judge, is the only name Christians should take upon them. All the addition allowable to this is simply to designate the *location* of such particular church; as for example, the "Church of God at Corinth"—"at Ephesus"—"at Philadelphia"—"at Lewiston Falls:" or, if there is more than one assembly in a town, or city, then it may be called the "Church of God in—or assembling at" its place (naming that place.) Beyond that, it seems to us, we should not go in giving or receiving a name. "The Reformed *Protestant* Society," &c., identifies brethren with Protestants, and thus approaches sec-

tarianism. We are for taking no name but the bible one: we are then at an equal remove from corrupt Protestantism and Romanism; and yet are wide open to receive all who wish to leave the corruptions of those organizations which are of human invention. If Christ has made us *free*, let us keep free. If others call us "Beelzebub," that is no reason why we should take their *name* or adopt another not known in the Scripture as the appellation of the followers of Christ. We have not, and are determined we will not adopt any of the unscriptural names which men have assumed, not even that of "Advent Church," which is equally sectarian and unscriptural as any other. Pursue your *object*, brethren, but keep to your first resolution—"the Bible, the whole Bible, *nothing but the Bible.*" That is as it should be: carry it out, and the name "Reformed Protestant Society" will not be found necessary.

We are pleased with the struggle these brethren are making, and hope God may guide them aright, bless them abundantly, and keep them safe from every snare.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY, 1852.

REMOVAL TO NEW YORK.—On the first of May we took up our residence in New York. It was painful to leave the beloved ones in Philadelphia with whom we had been so happily associated for the last eight years; and if personal gratification could have overpowered our judgment, of what was duty to God and his truth, we should have continued our residence in that city. We have left the loved ones there, however, with the less regret from a full conviction that they are not novices in the great truths of the Gospel of Christ, but are able to instruct others; and now especially that they are like the young eagles when their "nest is *stirred up*," they will "spread abroad their wings" to bear up others in the truth and ways of God.

Our conviction has been, for months past, that a removal to a more *central* position was demanded of us as an advocate of the unpopular truth of "Life and Immortality only through Jesus, our 'Life-Giver.'" We have been delayed from several causes in carrying our purpose into execution of removing to New York. We thought we ought to be located where we could with less expense of time and money visit various places in the State of New York and in New England. Nearly all our calls for labor and books were from the north, north-west, or east from this city. The fare on the Railroad between Philadelphia and this city is the most extravagant of any in the Northern States, so far as we know. This was one reason of our removal.

On this subject Br. Blain wrote us from New York in March, as follows:

I have been thinking, and feel more deeply than ever the importance of your being located somewhere in York state. It appears to me you can do comparatively little in Pennsylvania and New Jersey to what you could in this and the Eastern and Western States. In Philadelphia you of course do good; but when you go out you must be at the expense of time and money to come here. Pennsylvania and New Jersey will be the last of Northern States to understand and adopt our views. I conclude you are much better known this way than anywhere south of here, except in Philadelphia. We need your counsel and preaching as well as your paper. Having been the pioneer in the doctrine of Destruction, I find wherever I travel, you are known, and strong desires are felt to see and hear you. It seems to me your preaching ought not to be so much confined to one church; and besides that, many more of your papers and books would be scattered, if printed here, at Albany, Troy, or Rochester. For instance, from Albany or Troy, $1 to $1.50 would carry you to the large and intelligent villages I have just visited. You could visit Vermont and the north part of this State, and send books with less expense than you can to this city. I hope to make a market for $200 worth of your works the coming year.

You see the Western States are waking up to our views; and the travel by water, &c., to Albany and here would supply them with books cheaper and more conveniently, than from Philadelphia, and so more be sold.

I was kept awake last night by reflecting on your removal, &c., and feel as if the friends of truth have a kind of claim on your services in our midst. I pledge myself to efforts to sustain you, and hundreds would feel more pledged if you were nearer to them.

There is a great field from here to Albany; fare is cheap, and nothing has been done; but they read much more than in your State, out of Philadelphia.

Your dear Church would regret your removal—but while one might be grieved, a hundred would be cheered.

On the subject of the feelings of the Church with which we have been associated in Philadelphia, we received a communication, unasked, unlooked for, and wholly unexpected: represented to us as having been adopted *unanimously*. It is as follows:

TO ELDER GEORGE STORRS:

Dearly beloved in the Lord.—We, the undersigned, by the grace of God, your brethren in Jesus Christ, and in the patient waiting for his coming, desire to assure you that it is with sorrow of heart that we contemplate your removal from us.

Truly edifying has been your ministry among us. Very precious has been our fellowship in the faith and love of Jesus Christ, and in the blessed hope of his coming and kingdom.

Imperfect indeed have we been in the performance of our duties; yet we hope that, in some degree, we have appreciated your holy and disinterested labors of love for our spiritual and eternal welfare.

Truly, it has been your object to instruct us in the truth as it is in Jesus, that our faith may stand, not in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.

Sincerely and earnestly have you labored and prayed for us that we may not hold the truth in unrighteousness, but that, by a life influenced by love to God and love to man, we may prove that we have not received the grace of God in vain.

We doubt not, beloved brother, that your decision, in this important matter, has been influenced by

pure motives, and we unite our prayers with yours, that our loss may be gain to Jesus Christ, in your increased usefulness in winning souls to him, and in leading his disciples back to that 'simplicity' from which they have been corrupted by the pride and covetousness of selfish men, and to the practice of those commandments and ordinances which they have made void by their traditions. Oh, that it may so appear to our mutual joy and the divine glory in the day of the Lord.

Accompanying this imperfect expression of our christian respect and affection for one who will ever be dear to our hearts, is a small amount to aid you in cancelling the expenses of your expected removal. It is justly due to you. We hope that it may be acceptable as a small token of our grateful appreciation of your faithful services.

Commending you and yours to the love of God, and to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, we remain your affectionate brethren, in the blessed hope of re-union and of eternal life, at the glorious appearing of our dear Redeemer.

The Church from which this document was received is deeply on our heart; and our prayer is still, daily, to God for the members thereof, that they may be holy in heart and life, contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; which faith is, that of "Life through Jesus Christ." May they grow up more and more into our *life-giving* Lord.

It is now our intention, as health and circumstances permit, to visit the various places to which we have been, or may be invited, and proclaim "*Christ our Life.*" We do not expect to take the oversight of any one church, but hold ourself at liberty to act as the providence of God shall seem to demand of us. Sometimes it will be in traveling and preaching; at others it may be wholly with our pen. The Examiner will continue its course in search of Bible Truth; especially that for which it was originally commenced; yet holding ourself at full liberty to investigate other topics as we may have time and space.

—o—

BE PARTICULAR.—Let all please address us simply "GEO. STORRS, *New York.*" By adding anything to this, or directing to the *care* of anybody, you subject us to *extra* expense, and often to delay in getting your letters. We call at the Post Office daily when at home, and employ some one to do so for us in our absence. *Let this direction be remembered.* Write our name *plain*, and you need have no fears but that we shall get the letter if it arrives in New York.

—o—

DOUBLE NUMBERS OF THE EXAMINER.—Some may possibly not feel pleased that we should fill two monthly numbers with one subject; yet we think the majority of our readers will be glad that we have done so. The works we thus republish are not within the reach of many of our patrons, besides costing more than a year's subscription to the Examiner. In the May and June Examiner we gave you "*The Generations Gathered and Gathering;* or the Scripture Doctrine concerning Man in Death, by J. Panton Ham," a Congregational Minister, England. We gave our own opinion of its value, and we here add that of Elder M. Batcheler, of Pownal, Vt. He ordered a dozen copies after having received his regular number, and says:

"I think this is the master-piece of all. God bless Br. Ham for writing, and you for publishing it. It was a real feast to my mind. I thought of the policy of keeping back the state of the dead and the advent of Christ, for fear it would prevent people from looking at the destruction of the wicked. This sweeps away, at one stroke, all such human policy."

Many others, we doubt not, feel as does Br. Batcheler; and we hope they will act as promptly in putting the work into circulation. Price, single copy, 20 cents; six copies for $1. For $5 fifty copies. *Cash always with the order.*

The other work, by Br. Ham, "*Life and Death;* or the Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality," will fill a double number of the Examiner; and be issued as the August and September numbers. To subscribers, by the year, nothing extra is charged, though we have been at *extra expense* in issuing these works. The price of this last work is the same as the other. It will be sent to our subscribers *immediately.* We shall not then issue another number of the Examiner till the regular month for it, viz: October, unless something special should demand an earlier issue.

—o—

"BIBLE AGAINST TRADITION," *by Aaron Ellis.*—We did intend to have given another portion of that work immediately; but the cares and weariness of removal, both of ourself and Br. Read, have prevented our getting it ready for the press. We shall resume the work soon; and probably publish it all at once. Of this, however, we can speak definitely in a short time.

—o—

IMMORTAL-SOULISM.—The following specimen of Pagan fables was handed us by some person—we have forgotten who—taken from a tomb-stone. One would think it was sufficient to read such traditions to convince a thinking mind, either that the sentiment is purely mongrel-pagan, or that the Bible is a dim light, as it nowhere reveals such sentiments as here exhibited:

"The vessel's wreck'd, the voyage is o'er,
But th' immortal cargo's sav'd;
'Tis gone aloft, where spirits oft
Have gone, who earth's storms have braved.
The shattered hulk is resting here,
'Neath Christ the captain's eye;
'Twill rise again, its freight obtain,
And anchor in the sky."

FROM WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF.

Edinburg, Scotland, March 16, 1852.

Dear Brother.—At the close of last year I made up my mind to leave Musselburgh, and resolved to seek

a better and larger field for developing the life, views, &c., which are so much needed in this dark era. I fixed on Edinburgh, and having engaged a hall, I began to preach here about 8 weeks ago. Our meetings are very encouraging, and I doubt not much good will result from this effort, made in dependence on the God of mercy and faithfulness. The small tract sent will give you an idea of the principles on which we are proceeding. Hitherto, the Lord has opened and guided our way, and I feel very sure our confidence in Him will not be put to shame. As a family, we came here at the commencement of February, and the Lord is good to us. His promises are sure—"yea and amen in Christ Jesus." My little works are selling slowly, and the truth is gaining ground here and in Scotland I know now many real friends of our movement,—I mean our *common* movement—who are waiting for the Lord's coming with much desire, and are not ashamed of their hope of seeing him and of being like him when he comes. God has blessed my testimony; and a light is kindled now, which no power will be able to extinguish. Witnesses, though not exactly in a public way, are rising up in Scotland, and I doubt not, the Lord will ere long send forth some public testifiers to his truth and name. Lord send them soon, the fields are white.

I have just finished a small work, the title of which is "SOUL, or the Hebrew word *nephesh*, and the Greek word *psuche*." The design of this work is to show in a plain and popular manner, the Bible idea of SOUL; very different, as you well know, from the theological one. As soon as I see my way for issuing it, the printer will get it. You will, of course, get a copy. I have another work, "THE TREE OF LIFE," a *poem*—ready almost—it will extend to about 1800 lines. It will, of course, be rather a large work, and it may do good. It has cost me months on months of labor so as to render it in some small degree worthy of the grand theme of immortality through the Son of God. When it may be printed, I cannot as yet say. We must work; this is not our rest. Happy they who will be found working and watching when the Lord comes. I long for his coming, much. This life of toil and care will then end; this weary, woe-worn world will then find relief. Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

I think you are aware that there has been a small church in this city for some time, where the Life views are generally received by the members. They number about forty members, I think. With some of the members I am well acquainted, and know them to be truly pious and devoted to Jesus. Here is thus, as it were, a kind of double testimony in this city, for which I praise God. Some prefer being with them, some with us; so that between us, God, I trust, will be glorified in the enlightenment of saints and in the conversion of sinners. As I preach three times every Lord's day, I have no opportunity of being at any time with them; but I wish them every blessing.

Being so busy of late, I have got nothing sent you. I will try and send you a paper soon. The blessing of God rest on you and yours.

I am yours, in hope of immortality,

WM. G. MONCRIEFF.

P. S. The church in Musselburgh fully acquiesced in my movement; and we parted in love, and I got their blessing. They are still meeting as a church.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The foregoing interesting letter from Br. Moncrieff was sent us by private hands, and before it reached us, we had received the article, by mail, which appears on the first page of this number of the Examiner; and had also received the work on "Soul," &c., which we shall notice when we get time. We hope to see soon his "Poem" on "*The Tree of Life*," and hope it "may do" *much* "good."

The following is the "small tract" Br. M. speaks of, showing the "principles on which" they are acting in Edinburgh.

GOSPEL MISSION IN EDINBURGH.

"*Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, hath brought life and immortality (incorruptible life,) to light through the gospel.*"

It having been so often pressed, by christian friends, on the consideration of the Rev. W. G. Moncrieff, Musselburgh, that great good was most likely to be done in Edinburgh, were he to devote himself to the work of God there, he can no longer refrain from obeying what seems to him to be the call of duty.

A proper place, it is hoped, will very soon be got in Edinburgh, and then he will begin to preach; and, for a while at least, continue to do so three times every Lord's Day. Due public intimation will be given as to the place, and when the meetings are to commence.

There will be no door collections, and no seat rents.

A number of christian friends are taking an interest in this Life-Mission; and join with Mr. M. in his proposal, that the whole expense shall be defrayed only by the free out-comings of christian liberality. In no case can the world be rationally or scripturally asked to aid in upholding gospel institutions and efforts; on the pious alone such an easy yoke ought to rest, and to the friends of the Saviour this cause is hopefully intrusted. The disciples who join in the movement, and others anywhere who desire to assist it by donations are requested to forward them to the following persons: [Names omitted, ED. EX.]

Properly authorized persons will at times collect these donations, and be answerable for their expenditure in paying Hall rent, gas, advertisements,

tracts, in a word, all expense connected with the movement, excepting the support of the Preacher.

Mr. M. asks no hire, no stipend; but leaves the people of God who may wait on his preaching to act in the spirit of the passage "if we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?" in so far as they may deem that verse applicable to one in his circumstances, and in so far as they may be inclined and enabled to act on it. He seeks not man's, but men: resting,—and he has nothing else to rest upon,—resting on the promise "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you," humbly leaving a faithful God to determine how it shall be fulfilled to him and his.

The prayers of the godly are solicited on behalf of this effort for the spread of Bible-Christianity.

———o———

NORTHWESTERN TOUR.—We had hardly placed our family in a situation to "keep house," after our removal from Philadelphia to New York, when we set out on a visit to Auburn, over 300 miles from home; a distance, however, soon past by the power of steam. Our visit there was the first to that city. The appointment had been duly notified, and we commenced Thursday evening, May 18th, with a much larger audience than we expected, who gave deep attention to the word spoken. We enjoyed freedom and enlargement of thought while addressing them, and showing that "*God means what he says*, and *saith what he means*;" and has not left us to mistify his "*law and testimony*" by making something *more*, or entirely different, from its plain and obvious sense. Such mistifying the testimony of God is corrupting his word and handling it deceitfully; an awful responsibility rests upon those who have been guilty of this work. Many, charity leads us to think, in time past, have done this dreadful work *ignorantly*, but that plea cannot much longer be urged in their behalf. Our Lord said of some, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin." *Unavoidable* ignorance may be an excuse; but *wilful* ignorance has none. Such is all that which arises from the rejection of truth because it is unpopular, or because it may affect our character, standing, influence, or temporal interests. What force in the inquiry, "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another?" while they "seek not the honor that cometh from God *only*."

After the close of our first lecture, one of the *Spirit Rappers* came up to us with a book in his hand, saying, "Here is something that will overthrow all you have said! What you have said *agrees with the Bible*, but this book will overthrow it." "*That is*," we replied, "if your book is true, the *Bible is a lie*." "*Yes*," he replied. That was so frank that we gave him credit for honesty, and remarked, "No doubt, if the devil prevails, God will be *overthrown*." Auburn is one of the strongholds of this Satanic development; and we are glad that the veil is off, and they no longer profess any regard for the Bible. A very natural result of immortal-soulism, or of the theory that man by his creation is endowed with a soul or spirit that does not and cannot die, but survives, in conscious existence, that which the Bible denominates *death*. It is this unscriptural theory that has laid the foundation for *Spirit Rappers* to delude themselves and others.

Our lectures continued in Auburn one week, during which time we spoke nine times; as we have reason to think, with good effect. A deep interest was manifested by many attentive hearers to the close. The usual cry of "*infidelity*" was raised by some claiming to be leaders in and teachers of the immortal-soul doctrine and endless misery theory. One of that class, a minister, we were informed, "went about" saying, "The devil helps Mr. Storrs to preach." None of these things moved us. We know in whom we have believed; and it was said of our Master, by those who had no better argument, "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils:" so we rejoiced to be reproached with our Lord.

From Auburn we went to Rochester, seventy-five miles west. This place we have visited four times within the past two years. At this time we went to attend a Conference of brethren from various places. It was held four days, and was of a most agreeable and profitable character. There we became acquainted with numbers whom we had never before seen, several of whom were preachers of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and life only through Christ. We saw and heard men who are proclaiming this message, whom God has raised up of late, strong in the Lord and in his truth. The tidings of Eternal Life through the second Adam *alone*, and entrance thereby into the kingdom of God at the return *from* heaven of Messiah, are waking up attention more and more among candid and seriously disposed persons.

The time at the Rochester Conference was mostly spent in free and christian conversation on the glorious topics just mentioned. Five discourses were preached during the time we were together, to large and attentive congregations, and the communion of saints at the Lord's Supper also was enjoyed. The heavenly feeling and spirit which pervaded this Conference was comforting indeed, and its influence, we doubt not, will be felt for days and months to come.

———o———

EASTERN TOUR.—After our return from Auburn and Rochester, we remained at home only a few days and set out for New England. At Worcester, Mass., we spent several days in Conference with brethren from various parts of the country. This Conference was of like character with that at Rochester, N. Y.

A sweet christian spirit, love, harmony and liberty, with plain talking and preaching, characterised the daily assemblies for three days; at the close of which we parted with the conviction that the truth and love of God had a strong hold of the minds of those who met in that delightful convocation.

From Worcester we went to Boston, where we met several who had not attended the Conference. From Boston we proceeded to New Bedford, some sixty miles south, and was cordially received at the house of Br. John F. Vinal. At that place we remained eight days, and preached twelve times. This was to us a new field; we had never been in that city before. We trust much good will be the result of our labors there. An excellent band of brethren are found there, to whom Br. B. S. Batcheler, son of Eld. Batcheler, of Pownal, Vt., is preaching most of the time. Though a young man, we trust God will make him a polished shaft in pushing the truth home, of Life only in Christ at the coming and kingdom. Our interview with him, Br. Vinal, and others of like faith, was of an interesting character. We left there June 14th, and arrived safe in New York the next morning: thanks to our kind Father in heaven for his care over us and ours in our absence.

Our friends abroad will see why their letters have not been attended to sooner.

—o—

Visit to Philadelphia.—Since our return from New Bedford, we have visited our brethren in Philadelphia, and spent two Sabbaths with them. We had a good and pleasant interview with them, and trust we were mutually benefitted. In addition to this visit, we have issued the Examiner for July, August and September; having read proof and done the whole work of mailing with our own hands, as ever. Thus we have had no time to be idle.

—o—

The Examiner for July, and the *double number* for *August* and *September*, are sent together to all our subscribers. Be *particular* in getting them at your several Post Offices. In the interval between this and the issue of the October Examiner, we expect to spend most of our time traveling and proclaiming "*Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ alone*;" yet we painfully feel that it is only a *few places* we can visit. May the Lord of the harvest send forth more *laborers*.

—o—

Who will Help?—We wish to raise from $500 to $1000 as a fund to enable us to publish and keep on hand a larger amount of the works we are issuing. The calls for these works are constantly increasing, and might be increased to a much greater extent, but for the want of funds to publish larger editions. We are compelled to publish a few only at once, and cannot safely send these out either on commission or *credit*. We have already met with losses on the *credit* system: these losses *we* cannot bear; but if our friends will furnish the funds, so that we can pay our printers, and be enabled to keep an ample supply on hand, we will put the works so low, *for cash*, that any person will be able, and many will be *disposed* to buy, at *wholesale*, and scatter them through the land. But to do this we need and must have funds. Let those who are able and disposed, *give* to these funds: others can *loan* a given amount, which shall be *refunded*, if it is possible ever to do it. Will *you* help us in this matter?

We suggest, in the the meantime, that our friends unite in every place and raise funds to keep a *depot* of these works among them. Let them pay for all the works when they order them. If this idea was carried out, through the country, it would in a short time give us the funds we need; but in order to meet such a demand we need funds to start with. Let us hear from you.

—o—

Bible Examiner Office.—We use a part of Br. R. T. Young's Book Store, 140 Fulton Street, up stairs, for an office, at present. Br. Young will sell any of our works to those who call; but all letters to us should be directed as we have stated in another column.

—o—

Canandaigua, N. Y.—Br. Hahn, and others, may expect us there about the middle of July, to spend a week or ten days with them.

—o—

Philadelphia Subscribers, who do not receive the Examiner otherwise, will call for it at Br. Armstrong's Stationery and Book Store, No. 209 Callowhill street, north side, two doors below Sixth.

—o—

Postage on Tracts.—We are sorry to find the Postmaster General decides that *each* Tract, however small, is subject to postage *singly*. Hence, if forty Tracts are enclosed in one envelope, and all of them together do not weigh more than *once ounce*, they are charged as if they weighed forty ounces—that is, *each one* is charged *separately*. Our friends will see that if Tracts are ordered by mail, the postage to be pre-paid on them is more than we charge for the Tracts, on nearly all we publish. Under these circumstances, if Tracts are wanted, they had best to be ordered by the quantity, and sent by Express.

—o—

"The *Bible Examiner* for May and June, being Nos. 5 and 6 together, has been received; and upon an examination of its contents, we can truly say that it manifests an increasing interest, and gives a vast amount of useful reading. The editor has removed to New York. The Examiner is published monthly at one dollar for twelve numbers. Payment always in advance. Address *Geo. Storrs*, New York."

The above we cut from the "*Plymouth Banner*," a weekly, secular paper, published at Plymouth, Mar-

shal county, Ind , by Corbaley & Gladden. We thank them for their notice; especially, as notices from secular or religious papers is a thing we do not often have, unless it is to cast reproach upon us. We are glad to see that our friends Corbaley & Gladden are of a different spirit, and we hope their useful paper may have a wide circulation and ample support.

—o—

To Correspondents and others.—In our removal and immediate calls from home, communications and orders have not had that attention we could desire; and possibly some may have been overlooked. If anything of this kind has occurred, we will rectify it when informed. Some communications are of necessity, laid over to a later period than desirable, on account of our *second double number*, viz: August and September, which will be found deeply interesting, we trust. We have on hand another interesting article from Br. Moncrieff, which will appear at the earliest period possible. Br. Butler and others shall not be overlooked. Our time is so completely occupied in traveling and preaching this summer, however, that we can hardly find time to answer all as fully as desirable—they must bear with us. We have scarcely had a day at home since we removed to this city.

—o—

Ignorance.—We have found persons, members of some of the churches, who seemed as totally ignorant of the Scriptures as the Pagans. They do not pretend to read the Old Testament, but regard it as something that does not at all concern them; and as to the New, they think it presumption to attempt to understand it—that is a matter to be left to their minister: their printed church creed is the standard of their appeal, and they have no faith in "*the resurrection of the body*:" they regard it as folly to talk of any such thing. They imagine their *immortal souls* are to receive some kind of vehicle which will answer the purpose of a body, but no resurrection. This is the legitimate fruit of the immortal soul theory: it is making *infidels* of church members. Their priests may cry, of our preaching, "*infidelity*," as much as they please; the fact is, they are leading or driving the members of their churches directly into the blackest *infidelity;* and unless they change their preaching soon, they will find their flocks swept away with the rising stream of atheism and infidelity that now threatens to overwhelm Christendom. We sincerely pity the poor sheep who have so long been fed and starved on immortol-soulism and its legitimate offsprings—going to heaven at death, and no resurrection.

—o—

"The Mystery Solved; or, *A Bible Expose of the Spirit Rappers*, showing that they are not caused by the spirits of the dead, but by evil demons, or devils: By J. C. Bywater, a Minister of the Gospel."

Such is the title of a pamphlet of 120 pages, 12 mo., just issued, in which is given a history of these *manifestations*, and their true source and character exposed. It should be read by all. Price 20 cents. For sale by the author, Auburn, N. Y., and by J. Marsh, Rochester, N. Y. It is our intention also soon to have a supply of the work.

—o—

"The Wheat and the Chaff. A Discourse by J. S. White, Pastor of the Second Advent Church, Worcester, Mass." This Discourse discusses various topics of popular theology, and shows briefly and *scripturally* wherein they come short of the truth. It is a valuable work of some 20 pages octavo, and can be had of the author for $4 per 100, in paper covers. Six cents single copy.

—o—

Exchanges will please observe that the Bible Examiner is *removed* from Philadelphia to *New York*. Those who do not send accordingly, we shall conclude wish the exchange *discontinued*.

—o—

"Children's Friend."—We take pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to this paper, published at Rochester, N. Y., by O. R. L. Crozier, for the instruction and improvement of children. We think Br. Crozier well calculated to make such a paper both useful and entertaining; and hope he may be fully sustained in the work. The "Friend" is a quarto sheet of eight pages, issued monthly, at the following low rates: Single copy, for one year, 38 cents; four copies to one address, $1; fifty copies, to one address, $10.

☞ Address (post-paid) *O. R. L. Crozier*, Rochester, N. Y.

—o—

"The Advent Harbinger" is published weekly, by Joseph Marsh, at Rochester, N. Y. It is a large quarto sheet, of eight pages, ably and judiciously conducted, and well worthy the patronage of all serious inquirers, who prefer truth to the traditions of men. Terms, in advance, single copy, one year, $2. Six copies to one address, $9.

☞ Address, post-paid, *Joseph Marsh*, Rochester, N. Y.

—o—

"The Second Advent Watchman" is published at Hartford, Conn. It is a weekly paper of eight pages octavo, at $2 per year. We are glad to see that it is improving in its character, and hope it may yet become still more excellent. Address Dr. D. Crary, Hartford, Conn., postage paid.

—o—

"MACKNIGHT" AGAIN.

Bro. Storrs:—In examining the subject relative to the resurrection of the dead, I think it will be well to look at the creation of man, and what he lost by the fall. We find him placed in the garden a mortal be-

ing, susceptible of *death;* and to avert this death to which he was then liable, God placed a tree of life, that man might eat and not die; but man sinned and was driven out of the garden, lest he should eat of the tree of life and *live* in his sins. Now, what did man lose? I answer, the right to the tree of life; and, in consequence of the loss, death ensued; and we being in the loins of our father Adam, died with him: this is the first *death.* But the sentence was not executed immediately upon Adam; but he was permitted to bring forth his seed, by the justification of that seed to *life* through Jesus Christ, to which, I believe, the Apostle refers in Rom. 5: 18. Well, then, as through one offence, sentence came upon all men to condemnation, even so through one, righteousness, sentence came upon all men to justification of *life.* Now each individual is placed where Adam was. Christ is our tree of life. If a man refuse to eat of this tree and live, he perishes, or dies the second time; if you will have it, the second *death,* or loses life; but they that partake of this tree of life shall not be hurt of this death.

The world is under the condemnation of this death; and the ground of their condemnation is that they will not believe on the only begotten Son of God that they might have life. John 3: 18–19.

I understand, then, that Jesus Christ took upon himself the seed of Adam, which was corruptible, and became the subject of death. Not that he had sinned, but he took our nature upon himself, and that nature being corruptible, must perish, and cannot be sustained but by the Spirit of God, which Spirit it received when he became the *life*-giving Spirit with power by a resurrection of the *dead.*

Now, what says the Apostle? Adam the first man was animal; and as such gave that animal nature to his seed. But Christ, the second Adam, is spiritual, and gives this spiritual nature to his seed by a *resurrection from the dead.* "*Where, O death,* is thy sting? Where, *O grave,* is thy victory?" For, the sting of death is sin, (Jesus Christ having no sin, neither knew any sin, there was no sting in his death;) and the strength of sin is the law, (Jesus having no sin, though being made of our nature, the law had no dominion over him; hence he could not be holden of death.) Acts 2: 24. Now then, thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Victory over what? Answer, over the law, which is the strength of sin—which is the sting of death, which sin produced—which victory the wicked cannot sing, for they are hurt by this second death, and holden by the law, which hath dominion over them, and "the wrath of God abideth on them."

Now, if the *wicked* get loose from this law of death, and get the wrath of God removed from them, and get a resurrection from the dead, they can sing, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Will "Veritas" inform us to whom or what power this victory will be ascribed.

Yours, in hope of this resurrection,

MACKNIGHT.

FROM ELDER C. M. RICHMOND.

Gowanda, N. Y., May 17, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—There are a few in this place who believe and rejoice in the truth of *Immortality only in Christ.* The various publications of your office are out on their mission in this community; and I believe are doing a good work. But we have some infallibles here, who will not investigate this subject. They take the position that *they cannot be wrong,* and those who differ from them *cannot be right,* and so *very logically* conclude it is of no use for them to investigate the matter! But some seed will fall into good ground—the truth will prevail, and we have abundant reason for encouragement to continue our efforts.

The orthodox ministers of this village have recently put forth their best efforts to sustain the doctrine of the soul's natural immortality. Their efforts, however, will, I verily believe, turn out for the furtherance of gospel truth, rather than the establishment of the Popish error that men are not dependent on Christ for eternal life. Their discourses abounded in bare assertions, such as "the soul is immortal," "a spirit cannot die," &c., but every thinking person, it seems to me, could not fail to see the sophistry and weakness of their efforts. I wish you could come this way and preach a few discourses to us; or some other brother who will draw out the people and set the truth clearly and forcibly before them. I think much good would be the result.

P. S. Since writing the above, Rev. Mr. Tuttle, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has come out with one of his strongest efforts to sustain the doctrine of the conscious existence of the soul after death. He felt, he stated, that the error he opposed had become so strong that an effort to remove it was required. As his arguments were not new, and as they have been answered most triumphantly again and again, it is not necessary to review them. But some of his *assertions* were most astounding. One was, that "soul-sleepers" adduce but *one single* text from the New Testament to prove their doctrine! And this "remarkable fact" he regarded as significant of the weakness of their position! But what makes *this assertion* so "remarkable" is, Mr. T. is conversant with your writings, and quoted freely from your sermons, when he thought it would subserve his purpose. I shall improve the somewhat interested state of the public mind, in circulating more extensively your publications.

FROM A. N. SEYMOUR.

Bro. Storrs.—I have thought of communicating

to you often, but I have delayed till now. I have much I would like to say to you, which would gladden your heart as well as others of like precious faith. But I am not able to write out all I would wish, having for the past week suffered considerable from the fever and ague—the first I have had since I have been in Michigan. By a faithful application of cold and warm water, we succeeded in breaking this miserable disease. For three months past, and over, I have been holding meetings almost every Lord's day, in the town of Dearborn, some fifteen miles west of Detroit; and from the commencement, the interest has continued to increase. Opposition also commenced at the first meetings, and the battle has been a warm one, I will assure you. The Episcopal Methodist had a class here, and their members, class leaders, exhorters and preachers, have exhausted their strength in the battle, and have called to their aid the Presbyterians; so that one week ago, Sunday evening, Elder Knoll, Presbyterian Minister, preached on the Immortality of the Soul, having previously sent an appointment, and wished me to give it out in my meeting. This I did with pleasure, and earnestly requested my congregation to attend and prove all things. I told them that if Mr. Knoll proved the Immortality of the Soul, I should believe it, and confess it before the public. I was more particular in noticing his appointment, as the Methodists had labored hard to keep people away from my meeting, for fear they would be led astray. Mr. Knoll commenced his discourse, and I had the audacity to request him to give his quotations, so that I could note them down. This he would not do. He took for a text, 1 John 4: 1, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, &c." After classing us with the false Prophets and teachers, he told the people not to be carried about with every wind of doctrine, &c. Subsequently to this, he divided off his subject thus: 1. The time has come when the Divinity of Christ is denied. 2. The Atonement is denied. 3. Man's accountability is denied. 4. Immortality of the Soul is denied. 5. Future punishment and allotments are denied. 6. The new birth is denied. 7. Baptism alone saves people. That is his insinuation against us. His whole discourse was mixed up with misrepresentations. Either the man was most wofully ignorant, or dishonest; and I fear the latter is the case. When he come to the Immortality of the Soul, he assumed the position, and then said to the congregation, "*I hope you all believe it.*" I spoke out and said to him, "Sir, I want you should give us chapter and verse for that doctrine. He objected. Said I, we must have the testimony if you have it. Still he refused. Said I, I will give you $10,00 if you will give us one passage that teaches that doctrine. But it came not. "*Buy the truth.*" I was determined the peoples' eyes should be opened; and this discourse, from such a source, has done more to open the eyes of the people than any transaction that has taken place since the commencement. Amen. I expect we shall have to go the round with the sects. If we do, it will be a hard task; for where there are so many against us, we shall be obliged to talk a great deal. But by the grace of God, we do not intend to yield the ground one single inch to no sect in the land. We have got a strong foothold, and we shall try in the name of the Lord to keep it. The peoples' eyes are wide open to the *isms* of the day, and quite a number are settled in the faith already. A week ago last Sunday, four put on Christ by baptism; and there are a number more going forward soon. A tent meeting commences there, the 17th of June.

I wish to know whether you are intending to come west this summer or not? We should be exceedingly happy to see you here. Many want to hear from Brother Storrs. Much good would be the result, I fully believe. If you come (which I hope you will do,) let me know when, so that I can make arrangements for meetings. We want a tent meeting in Plymouth when you are here. Please inform me the earliest opportunity.

Yours in hope of life through Christ,

Plymouth, Wayne county, Mich., June 7th, 1852.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—It would give us great pleasure to visit Michigan, but fear we shall not be able to reach there at present. We will not, however, forget that interesting field, and if possible visit it.

WHAT IS DEATH?—The following is one of the omitted notes in Mr. Ham's work on Life and Death:—

"Cruden, in his Concordance, under the word *Death*, thus expounds its meaning, and the nature of the curse which Adam has transmitted to his posterity.

"Death," he says, "signifies *the separation of the soul from the body*,—this is TEMPORAL DEATH. *A separation of soul and body from God's favor in this life*, which is the state of all unregenerated and unrenewed persons, who are without the light of knowledge, and the quickening power of grace,—this is SPIRITUAL DEATH. *The perpetual separation of the whole man from God's heavenly presence and glory, to be tormented for ever* with the devil and his angels,—this is the second death, or ETERNAL DEATH. *To all these kinds of death Adam made himself and his posterity liable*, by transgressing the commandment of God in eating the forbidden fruit."

This preposterous definition of the scripture word death, is that which is endorsed by modern Christian teachers! Can such extravagancies fail to shock the understandings of an intelligent and truth-seeking age? Who can be surprised that such teaching should furnish a theme for the severest sarcasms of the sceptic, and enable him to point the

finger of scorn at the Christian profession? If the above be the definition of the scripture term death, then it must be applied, to be consistent, to other passages where this word occurs. "We see Jesus," says the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, "who was made a little lower than the angels for *the suffering of death*, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God *should taste death* for every man." Heb. ii. 9.

"According therefore to the orthodox definition, as given by Cruden, Christ must have suffered this threefold death. 1st. Temporal Death, or the separation of soul and body. 2ndly. Spiritual Death, or the separation of the whole nature from God's favor in this life. 3rdly. Eternal Death, or the perpetual separation of the whole man from God, to be tormented for ever with the devil and his angels! Can any one believe that Christ suffered this? Of course not; not even the orthodox believe this, though in consistency they are bound to do so. They invent a *commutation* theory to get out of their difficulty.

"In the following passage the word death occurs three times. 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that *through death* he might destroy him that had the *power of death*, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through *fear of death* were all their life-time subject to bondage.' Heb. ii. 14, 15.

"Now the common sense principle of interpretation requires us to understand that *the death* mankind *feared*, the *death* the devil had the *power of*, and the *death* which Christ died, *are all the same.* If, therefore, it is the *threefold* death which Satan has the power of, and mankind fear, Christ must have suffered this *threefold death.* But this would have made redemption impossible, because one element in this death is eternal torment in a state of perpetual banishment from God! Orthodoxy and scripture are as much at variance as orthodoxy and common sense. The passage just quoted, moreover, obliges the conclusion that *death* in the apostolic age, and prior to that period, had no such mystic sense as that which now has the accredited seal of popular orthodoxy, a separation of the conscious and immortal soul from the unconscious body; that, on the contrary, it was regarded as a complete and dreaded dominion over the entire conscious humanity, which blasted the hopes, froze the energies, and broke the spirits of the race so far as no clearly defined views of a future life by resurrection were possessed. Under such circumstances its melancholy anticipation sat like an incubus upon the life-loving heart of humanity—it was a "bondage" which clung with dismal and oppressive tenacity to them all their life-time, and from which they could only be effectually delivered by a sure and certain hope of resurrection from the dead, through the resurrection of Christ. Surely, it was the fear of this all-engulfing death, not of the threefold death of the modern church, which begat the "bondage" of which the text speaks."

"Some of our readers," writes the late learned Dr. J. Pye Smith, "may be surprised at our having translated *nephesh hhaya* by *living animal.* There are good interpreters and preachers who, confiding in the common translation, *living soul*, have maintained that here is intimated the distinctive pre-eminence of man above the inferior animals, as possessed of an immaterial and immortal spirit. . . . *we should be acting unfaithfully if we were to affirm its being contained or implied in this passage.*"—*Kitto's Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., Art. Adam.*

"FIRE," says Mr. Hinton, "is, in my view, a much fitter emblem of suffering than of extinction, since fire *destroys* nothing."—*Athanasia*, p. 369. Fire certainly does not annihilate *matter;* but it changes or *destroys* its *mode of existence;* and, therefore, since fire destroys that condition of existence which is called *life*, it is a proper emblem of *extinction.*"—*J. Panton Ham.*

It appears to me to be distinctly revealed in the Bible, that the universe shall be entirely purged of evil. How, except on this supposition, can the declaration that "God shall be all in all" be realized? If God shall be "*all in all*," none but the *sanctified* will exist; for, surely in no sense will God be *in the wicked.* Satan himself and all the apostate spirits will, at the time of the perdition of the ungodly, be punished and destroyed. "That through death He might *destroy him* that had the power of death, that is, *the devil.*" Heb. 2: 14; see also 2 Peter 3: 13.—*J. Panton Ham.*

DEFINITIONS.—It may be said that the terms *existence* and *non-existence* are not definitions of *life* and *death;* but it should be borne in mind, that we speak of these terms, not in the *abstract*, but in a special relation, i. e., to *man. Life*, according to scripture usage, and in this relation, signifies *the continuance of that existence which is proper to man*; and *death*, of course the opposite, or *the cessation of that existence which is proper to man.* The regenerate have *life*, inasmuch as their existence will *never have an end;* the unregenerate have *not* life, because their existence *will have an end.* In this sense I would understand the language of the apostle, "He that hath the Son hath *life;* and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not life.*" 1 John 5: 12.—*Ham.*

ERRATA *in the Bible Examiner for January*, 1852. P. 2, line 4 from bottom, right column, for *shorts* read *shoots.*

P. 3, line 10 from top, left column, for *age* read *aye.*

Read carefully and patiently the July, August and September numbers of the Examiner. You will be well paid.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. NEW YORK, AUGUST & SEPTEMBER, 1852. NOS. 8 & 9

LIFE AND DEATH.

EXTRACTS FROM PREFACES TO THE FIRST AND SECOND EDITIONS.

The views here developed the author firmly embraces; and, believing them to involve a just conception of the scheme and details of Evangelical Religion, he was induced to give them a marked prominence in the course of his ordinary ministrations. But, reminded how natural it is for the mind, especially the opening mind of youth and inexperience, to attach undue importance to its fresh informations, he confined them to the secrecy of his own bosom, even for some time after his convictions were fully matured, that the enthusiasm which novelty often begets might be sobered by calmer and more lengthened reflection. Subsequent study of Divine Truth tended but to strengthen conviction, and the decision of conscience was deemed to be that of prudence, in the course which it appeared to be a duty to adopt.

It has appeared to the Author that the speculative reason has had more to do in the discussion of religious doctrines than is consistent with the profession that the Bible is the sole and efficient teacher in religion. And perhaps nowhere do Evangelical Divines of the present day exhibit more the speculative tendency than in their arguments in favor of the natural immortality of man, and the nature of future punishment. On the former of these subjects I may, in illustration of the summary manner in which the argument from Scripture is disposed of, quote the language of a highly respectable writer, in his animadversions on an argument of the Rev. Geo. Storrs:

"'Man,' he says, 'that is, Adam, was a probationer;' no doubt of it. 'For what?' is a question to which revelation furnishes no answer, and which may well be deemed therefore of no great importance *to us*."—*Rev. J. H. Hinton, "Athanasia," p.* 341.

Is it conceivable that the Bible should reveal the fact that Adam was a "*probationer*," and yet not reveal "*for what*" he was a probationer? The statement that "revelation furnishes no answer" to this question, is most surprising. Is not the narrative of the Edenic dispensation designed to be an answer to it? Surely it will not be conceded to the author of "Athanasia" that the answer is "of no great importance TO US!" It is because some have attached so little importance to this portion of the inspired narrative, and have sought their information in their own speculations, that they have adopted the splendid but hurtful fiction of unconditional natural immortality.

These lectures suppose the Bible capable of answering the several questions raised in them. They appeal exclusively to the Scriptures as their sole criteria, to whose Author and His grace they are reverently and hopefully commended.

In sending forth a second edition of these lectures, the author is but yielding to the public demand which has been created for them—a demand to which he the more readily responds since the subjects of which they treat are not of mere local and transient interest, but appertain to the highest interests, both temporal and eternal, of mankind.

It is gratifying, and a cause for devout thankfulness, that, notwithstanding the misrepresentations and indiscriminate opposition which have been endured in the public advocacy of the scriptural truths advanced in this volume—some, and these not a few, have bestowed upon it a candid and dispassionate investigation, and the result of their reading and reflection has been the cheerful addition of their testimony to its general scriptural integrity.

Two years have elapsed since the first edition of these lectures was published. During this interval an increased acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures and a clearer understanding of the doctrines here set forth, have enabled me to modify and improve, and in some instances have obliged me to expunge statements which I had previously published. I am free to confess this much because candor demands it, and furthermore I am aware how common it is for unscrupulous opponents to endeavor to excite prejudice against an obnoxious writer by contrasting his more recent opinions with those he may previously have maintained, a course which I am solicitous here to repudiate both as unfair in controversy, and adverse to the interests of truth. The pious and learned Dr. Watts has said: "Though a sentence or two from any man's former writings may be cited, perhaps to confront his later thoughts, yet that is not sufficient to refute them: all that it will prove is this, that that man keeps his mind ever open to conviction, and that he is willing and desirous to change a darker for a clearer idea. It will only declare to the world that he can part with a mistake for the hope of truth, that he dares confess himself a fallible creature, and that his knowledge is capable of improvement. It becomes the all-wise God, and not mortal man to be unchangeable. It doth not belong to such poor imperfect beings as we are, to remain forever unmoveable in all the same opinions that we have once indulged, nor to stamp every sentiment with immortality. For a man to be obstinately tenacious of an old mistake, and incorrigibly fond of any obscure phrase or conception, because he has once admitted it, is the shame, and not the glory of human nature."

With the same eminent man I may venture unostentatiously to add: "When I apply myself with diligence to make further inquiries into the great doctrines of the gospel, I would never make my own former opinions the standard of truth, and the rule by which to determine my future judgment. My work is always to lay the Bible before me, to consult that sacred and infallible guide, and to square and adjust all my sentiments by that certain and unerring rule. It is to this supreme judge of controversies that I pay an unreserved submission, and would derive all further light from this fountain. I thank God that I have learned to retract my former sentiments, and change them, when upon stricter search and review, they appear less agreeable to the Divine standard of faith."

J. P. HAM.

Bristol, England, April, 1851.

LECTURE I.—THE EDENIC DISPENSATION.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—GEN. 2: 7.

It may reasonably be presumed, apart from any overweening sense of one's own personal claims upon public attention, that, in announcing a series of discourses on the "Theology of the Bible," some inquisitiveness may have been excited in the minds of those who feel any interest in the truth; and, perhaps, a state of mind has been antecedently produced, which is rather curious and disquiet than devoutly reflective and calm, and which may, in consequence, disturb that consciousness of interested fellowship in which I desire we should come, at the present time, to the oracle of truth.

It is a great attainment, and evinces a noble independence, when a mind will, in the spirit of earnest devotion and inquiry, look the truth humbly but steadily in the face; and, without anticipations and pre-judgments, go whithersoever it is directed. It often happens that the calm and independent current of our thoughts, in the investigation of truth, is interrupted by a foresight of the conclusion which we are about to reach—a conclusion which, because opposed to our previous belief, is, on this account, anxiously avoided. The inquirer, thus taken by surprise, is injuriously checked by his prejudices; and, unless accustomed to independent thought and urged on by the irrepressible thirst after truth, forecloses abruptly the prosecution of the inquiry.

It were too much to presume that, in a mixed assembly like the present, none should be mentally circumstanced as I have supposed: I hope, however, notwithstanding this forestalling tendency, that I may be permitted to lead the way in these interesting inquiries, in which I shall endeavor from the Bible to show, that the popular religious teaching gives an incorrect representation of the fall of man, and as a consequence, does not accurately represent his redemption by Christ. The scriptures, I have been led to believe, exhibit the fall of man as a more intelligible and complete ruin, and the redemption by Christ as a more rational and blessed recovery, than is commonly taught. My endeavor will be to indicate the teaching of the Bible on the important subject of human immortality, with the view of proving that this doctrine, as professed by the modern Christian church, is a tradition of the old speculative philosophy of the heathen sages, which is nowhere recognized in, but is most repugnant to the word of God.

But this is an undertaking which will probably be considered by many as unnecessary as it is presumptuous. Is it possible, some may ask, that the Christian church can have nurtured in her bosom such mischievous and distracting errors, and that through a long series of ages they should not have been discovered, and that it remains for us in the nineteenth century to go back to first principles, and revise the basis of our holy faith? Even so. If all impartial history assures us, that very early in the Christian era the seeds of serious errors were sown in the bosom of the church—and if the progress of that history exhibits, in its many controversies, the germination and too successful growth of these errors, is it not rather probable that the lateness of the period in which we live, instead of putting us beyond their reach, has afforded a longer time for their destructive maturity, and that now may be the harvest-time of many early errors, and we may in reality be feeding upon their fruit? If the living and "true vine" be closely pressed upon by the forest trees of old errors, is it improbable that the "branches" of "the true vine" shall put forth their tendrils to these deceitful props, and by seeking other supports, be unconsciously dishonoring the parent stock? Let not then the supposition of a necessary doctrinal perfection prejudice the mind in the prosecution of this inquiry. No less authority than Douglas thus wrote on the rise of error in the primitive church:—"The early Christians were by no means aware of the extent of their danger when they enumerated only the heresies and the heretics, that were without the church. *The same errors were also spreading within.* Those who were vehement and determined in their errors, naturally separated themselves from others, and distinguished themselves by a peculiar name, while the many, through whose minds the same erroneous notions of philosophy or superstition were vaguely floating, remained included in the bosom of the church. As the multitude of believers increased, the number of crude and mistaken opinions they brought with them were multiplied also; and the study of the scriptures, the only cure for these evils, was either neglected, or pursued upon visionary principles. While the doctors of the church were refuting heretics, they were often cherishing in their own writing the seeds of future heresies; and the tone of feeling and the mode of thinking among Christians was rapidly receding from the standard of scripture and the oracles of truth."

In this and the following discourses, I desire to adhere closely to the word of God—to take this word as the infallible instructor in all the matters of our religious faith and practice. It is not with human opinions, whether right or wrong, that I desire to have to do—although these must, of necessity, be occasionally referred to—but with the plain and authoritative teachings of God. To this I have endeavored to bring my own mind, from the conscious insufficiency and unsatisfactory character of much which I had been taught to believe was the revelation of God, but which I am constrained to regard as but the doctrines and commandments of men.

Mr. Noel, in his work on "The Union of the Church with the State," well observes, that since the doctrine of Christ "has been preached, men can no longer receive the creed of their fathers or of their country without investigation; but each one is bound to search after truth, to receive it, to maintain it, and to promulgate it in the world, in opposition to all error, however venerable or popular. Our Lord predicted that this novel exercise of conscience in matters of religion, this independent inquiry and resolute profession, would disturb society everywhere to its very foundations. 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword;' to which may be added another declaration of our Lord, 'I am come to send fire on the earth.'" And while this is the predicted effect of making conscience of our creed, the obligation to do so is no less obvious: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind;" "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

All who are accustomed to investigate the grounds of their own religious faith, and who are in the habit of contemplating the development of the religious opinions of others, will readily concur with me, that considerable vagueness, and even actual ignorance, with respect to religious doctrines, exist in the minds of the majority of religious persons; and that a very considerable proportion of religious belief is rather to be regarded as traditionary and educational, than the result of enlightened conviction. May not this be chiefly traced to the fact, that religion is propagated rather *independently* of the bible, than by its supreme authority, as the source of all religious teaching? There is an understood creed, conven-

tionally stereotyped in the minds of all so-called orthodox believers, according to which the correctness of any belief is examined, and by which it is approved or condemned. We have an authoritative tribunal, a ghostly council, as virtually a spiritual council as either that of Carthage or Trent, with canons and formularies as fixed; the effect of which is to awe and intimidate any independent mind that shall be bold enough, in the consciousness of a sacred duty, to sit at the feet of Jesus and learn of him. One has only to entertain a different opinion, even on some minor point of religious belief, from the orthodox multitude, and immediately suspicion, hard names, and sometimes something worse, become the recompense of such temerity. Roman Pontiffs, alas! are not the only Popes who have troubled the churches of Jesus Christ. Protestantism, with all its protestations, has had its Popes; and even now, while Romanism has *one* Pope, Protestantism has *many*. In this respect Protestantism has become deprotestantized, and needs to revise and revive its noble position—the bible, the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

The character of these discourses will be rather expository than controversial. An attempt will be made to reply to the question, "What saith the scripture?" on the successively connected subjects which I have proposed to bring before you. The subject for our present consideration is, the scriptural representation of man—his constitution, probation and fall.

Turning to the book Genesis, where the inspired account of the creation and primitive condition of man is recorded, we learn that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." It must be confessed that the first creation of man is fitted to awaken humiliating reflections on our constitutional original, and to check the complacency with which we are wont to dwell upon our distinctive nature. There is a disposition in man to exalt himself too highly, and to talk extravagantly of his native excellence. His language often indicates the belief that he is by natural constitution allied, in some very important respects, to God; and that he possesses, although in a vastly inferior degree, attributes and capabilities similar to those of the Supreme Being. In some sense this is indeed true; but, in opposition to the conceit of the native constitution of man which is commonly entertained, I cannot but regard the sacred history as designedly teaching us that our origin is extremely humble, and that our constitutional alliance is less with the immortal Deity than with the mortal and perishable earth. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Considerable emphasis is placed upon the fact that man was originally formed "of the *dust of the ground*," an emphasis which appears to me to be inexplicable, except on the supposition that the scriptures teach the *native mortality*, and *not* the immortality of mankind.

We are accustomed to assume a phraseology when speaking of the human constitution, singularly different from that which the bible uniformly employs. We speak of the *soul*, as suggesting the *essence* and *destiny* of human nature, and not unfrequently as being properly and eminently *the man;* but the bible gives a marked prominence to the *material form* which was constructed out "of the dust of the ground," and points rather to *that* as suggesting the essence and destiny of man. Observe the phraseology, "God formed man"—not the body of man, but *man*—"of the dust of the ground." And after the unsuccessful probation of our first parent, and he was cast forth from Eden, the curse is expressed in terms as definite as language can possibly furnish: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till *thou return unto the ground;* for *out of it* wast thou taken; for *dust* thou art, and unto *dust* shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19.

Now, let it be remarked that this very distinct and emphatic language is employed *after* it had been said, at the time of the creation of Adam, that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul"—or as the word *soul* here means, a living *person*. We should have expected, if these words were intended to teach that the breathing "into man the breath of life" signified the impartation to him of an *immortal* or undying spirit, and that the possession of such a spirit suggests the essence and destiny of man's nature, that the curse would have been expressed in very different language from that which is actually employed; instead of which it is most explicitly and significantly suggested, even *after* the operation of breathing "into man the breath of life," that the essence and destiny of the nature is *not* an immortal, but a mortal and perishable existence—"dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The terms point out the personality of the first Adam as involved in his perishable and mortal nature. "Dust *thou*"—thyself, thy personality—dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return.

In further corroboration that the phrase, "the breath of life" which God "breathed" into Adam, does not imply the constitutional immortality of the human soul, permit me to call your attention to the very significant language in which this creative act of God is recorded. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." That spark of life which the vivifying breath of God kindled in Adam, and so lit up his personal consciousness, did not descend into the depth of his human constitution to enthrone itself in an imperishable seat; it trembled, as it were, on the surface of his being, as if tarrying for a season only. The tenure of that life, so far from being eternal, is suggested as both temporal and precarious. The "breath of life" was but "breathed *into his nostrils.*" And in laying an emphasis on these words, I do not unduly exaggerate their importance, as the following scriptural examples of their usage will testify. The prophet, when he would express the helplessness and mortality of man, thus writes, "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of?" Isa. 2: 22. And yet more definite and significant is the language of the patriarch, "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils." Job 27: 3. The breathing into Adam's nostrils the breath of life imparted not immortality, but life and consciousness to him; the *duration* of that life was altogether an independent consideration. *Before* this divine act, Adam was a *man*, after it he became *not* an immortal man, but simply a *living* man. "Man became a living soul," that is, a living person.

Now, it is commonly said, that the "breath of life" which God breathed into Adam was an immortal soul. The opponent who avails himself of this argument, should be reminded that it proves much more than he will be disposed to concede, unless he believes in the immortality of the whole animal creation. If the phrase *breath of life* proves that Adam had an immortal soul, then it also proves that every animal, beast, bird, fish, and reptile, has an immortal soul. Of the animals saved from the deluge we read, "They went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life.* And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; *all in whose nostrils was the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land

died. And *every living substance* was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth, and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the dark." Gen. 7: 15, 21–23.

In this passage it is obvious that the whole animal creation, including man, is comprehended in the phrases *all flesh* and *every living substance*; and in reference to them *all*, without any distinction, it is written, "in whose nostrils was *the breath of life*." Of them all—man, beast, fowl, reptile, animated by *the breath of life*, we are told that they *died* and were *destroyed*. The *breath of life* cannot therefore mean an immortal, or deathless spirit, otherwise the whole animal creation are immortal; and it would, moreover, have been impossible that either by the deluge or any other catastrophe they should have died and been destroyed. What is immortal is necessarily indestructible and deathless. If man's soul is his personal self, and is possessed of immortality, man cannot *die*, nor be *destroyed*.

The last clause of the text under consideration informs us of the *product* of this creative act of God; and, therefore, could there have been brought no evidence whatever to show the value of the phrase, *the breath of life*, since it is recorded what the product was—what, that is, "man *became*;" it would be sufficient, if it be possible, to demonstrate, by scriptural evidence what is the nature of this production—in other words, what is the meaning of the phrase *living soul*. God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Every candid disputant will allow, that to fix the true meaning of the phrase, "living soul," is to preclude any argument founded upon the process of breathing into man the breath of life. What is the meaning, then, of this phrase? Does it or does it not mean that Adam became an *immortal soul?* Relying solely upon scriptural evidence, I hesitate not to reply, that it does *not* teach that Adam became immortal in any sense. For, in the first place, it is a phrase that is not restricted in its application to Adam, but is applied equally to all the inferior creatures. In Gen. 1: 20, we read, "God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life," or, as it is in the marginal reading, and which is the literal translation, "living soul." In the original Hebrew, in all the following places—Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30; 2: 19; 9: 12, 16—it is the same language that is employed of the lower animals as of man—they are invariably called "living souls." This fact, then, destroys the possibility of building up the doctrine of the soul's immortality upon such a basis. We have, moreover, a more direct and emphatic testimony to the value of this phrase, in the authoritative commentary upon it of the Apostle Paul. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle quotes this text for a purpose so manifest and unmistakeable, that if his reasoning be impartially attended to and accepted, not only would all discussion about the meaning of this text in particular be for ever set at rest, but the doctrine of the soul's immortality would be driven from the arena of controversy, as a philosophical figment, inconsistent with and detrimental to scriptural Christianity. In the fifteenth chapter of this epistle, where he discourses with considerable particularity on death and resurrection, he thus observes, "It is sown a *natural* body, it is raised a *spiritual* body." The term *natural* in our translation is in the Greek an adjective formed from the substantive *soul*, and, therefore, its most literal English equivalent is not *natural*, but *soulical*. It is sown a *soulical body*, that is, a body animated by a soul, or in other words, a living body, all of which "is sown" in death, and "raised" in resurrection. Paul does not use the word "body" either here or elsewhere in the modern conventional sense, of the mere tabernacle or fleshly garment of the soul. As employed by him and the sacred writers generally, we are compelled to understand it, as comprising the human nature as a complete whole, the essential basis of which is a material body, mortal and corruptible, and which is animated by a temporary life. For the sake of illustrating and confirming the foregoing statement, I would instance the following passages, "I beseech you that ye present your *bodies* a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. 12: 1. Surely Paul did not enjoin upon the Roman believers that they should present their *bodies* merely, but their *entire* selves. Again, when he says, "We are willing rather to be *absent from the body*, and to be present with the Lord," he does not mean that the soul is the human personality distinct from the body, and that at death the soul leaves the body, and is present with the Lord. Paul's idea of absence from the body, if we are to judge by the analogy of his doctrinal teaching, is *an absence from the present condition of the entire human nature as mortal, and under the dominion of death;* to be absent from which is to be entirely liberated from liability to death, and to be invested with immortality; which is, at the time of resurrection, when 'this mortal shall put on immortality,' and when, not before, believers will be absent from the body and present with the Lord.

In the same comprehensive sense is the word *soul* used by the sacred writers, not to signify the essence of man distinct from his body, but the *complete man*, whose characteristic nature is a rational living organization—the essential basis of which lies not in an indestructible soul or spirit, but in a material and perishable body.

Attaching then the Apostle's idea to the words which he employs, we see clearly what *he* means us to understand by the phrase "living soul," and what is the real constitution of the human nature. "There is a natural body (a *soul body*) and there is a spiritual body (a *spirit body*.) And *so* it is written, the first man Adam was made a *living soul*, (a living person,) the last Adam was made a *quickening spirit*," (a life giving power.) Here the Apostle proves the mortality of man by the very phrase which the advocates of the popular doctrine bring to prove the soul's immortality! He contrasts the first Adam with the last Adam, or Christ—the first is only a 'living soul,' a mere temporal existence, the last, or Christ "hath life in himself," and is the "quickening or life-giving spirit." And with greater particularity Paul proceeds to state the mortality of man. "Howbeit that was *not* first which is *spiritual* (life-possessing or immortal,) but that which is *natural* (soulical, animal or mortal,) and *afterward* that which is *spiritual*. The first man is of the earth, earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy, (that is, mortal and perishable,) and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly, (that is, immortal, and heirs of the everlasting life.) Now this I say, brethren, that *flesh* and *blood* (the mortal creature man) cannot inherit the kingdom of God, (because that kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom, and "flesh and blood" is not immortal and everlasting) neither doth *corruption* (and man is corrupt and *must* decay) inherit *incorruption*. For this *corruptible* (which is the character of our present human nature) *must put on incorruption*, and this *mortal* (for such we are by natural generation) must put on immortality." It demands very special attention that Paul does *not* say that the

incorruptible soul, the immortal soul, is to "put on incorruption and immortality," but 'this corruptible' and 'this mortal.' The whole human nature of man is corruptible and mortal, and before it can enter into life, must be endowed with an everlasting or immortal quality. "So when *this corruptible* shall have *put on incorruption*, and *this mortal* shall have *put on immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory;" "mortality is swallowed up of life," And so being 'absent from the *body*"—the mortal and corruptible nature of man, by means of resurrection from the dead in a *spiritual body*, or life-endowed nature, we, if we are Christ's, shall "be present with the Lord," by whom, as by 'the quickening spirit,' we are raised. 'Thanks to God who giveth us the victory' over the mortal nature or *body* 'through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

The passage just referred to is, according to some, a scriptural proof of the doctrine of man's native immortality. Besides what has just been advanced in opposition to this interpretation of the passage, and which, in my judgment, is most conclusive, I would ask, if the language in question would convey such an idea as that of the native immortality of man to any one, who, ignorant of the sense generally put upon it, should for the first time be required to express its meaning? I cannot but think that, to one unbiassed in his judgment by a conventionally understood meaning, and uninfluenced by attachment to a creed, the natural signification of the passage would appear to be this—that after the creation of man from the dust of the ground, God breathed into him, and he became an *animated* existence. There surely is nothing in the term 'living' that suggests the idea of *unlimited duration* of existence, but only a *different condition* of existence from what was presented before. Until breath was put within him, and thus the first impulse was imparted to the human mechanism, man was only a lifeless form; but after this Divine act man became 'a living soul,' that is, an *animated* existence.

In Gen. 1: 27, we read, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him: male and female created he them." Upon this language more emphasis is laid by the advocates of the native immortality of man. Man having been created "in the image of God," it is affirmed that he must have been created *immortal*, because that "image" would have been imperfect without this element in his constitution. In reply to this statement I would observe that it is a perfectly gratuitous assertion, destitute of all evidence, and resting only upon an assumed probability. It will surely not be maintained that man, because he is said to have been created in the Divine *image*, is like the Divine Being in *every* attribute of his nature. That nature can, in this extensive sense, have no "image" or "likeness." Immortality is one of the peculiar attributes of the divine nature, and why then should *one* only of these peculiar attributes be selected, and not *all* of them, as properly involved in the "image" and "likeness" of God? If immortality be selected, why not select *every other* attribute involved in the complete similitude of the Deity? Now, we have a direct scripture prohibition against the assumption of the attribute of immortality by man; for the Apostle Paul, in his epistle to Timothy, distinctly asserts that "God * * only hath immortality." 1 Tim. 6: 16. To this it is replied that God hath immortality in a peculiar sense, that his immortality is essential and underived, and looks back into the infinite past, as well as forward into the infinite future; while man's immortality is dependant upon the Divine will, and has no retrospective but only a prospective relation. This admission satisfactorily proves that there cannot therefore be any "image" or "likeness" of God in this respect, if man's immortality is quite *another* attribute, and so materially different from the immortality of God. Let it be distinctly borne in mind, that the argument for man's natural immortality is established upon the statement in Genesis, that he is made in the Divine *image* or *likeness*. Now, there is a very material respect in which this *image* or *likeness* fails as we have seen, and this is, that God's immortality embraces eternity—the eternity past and the eternity future, while the assumed immortality of man embraces only the eternity to come. Man's immortality, then, is quite *a distinct idea, a widely different attribute;* it is not the *image* or *likeness* of God's immortality.

The attributes in which man resembles God, are the *intellectual* and *moral* attributes of his nature. Here, it is true, there is a wide difference in the respective perfection of these attributes. As possessed by God, they are absolutely perfect; possessed by men, they are but imperfect. The reason and moral nature of man are infinitely inferior in their capacity and excellence to those of God, but yet they are *images, likenesses* of the Divine reason and moral nature, the difference being, that they are not possessed by man in the same degree and perfection as they exist in God. The immortality of God is incapable of an *image* or *likeness*, since it admits of no degrees and no imperfection: it is the exclusive prerogative of the Divine self-existence.

To claim for the original constitution of the human nature the attribute of immortality, because it is an attribute of the Divine nature, is therefore a most palpable mistake, since of all other attributes demonstrative of the Divine personality and supremacy, this is most frequently selected by Jehovah himself. Thus the memorable reply to Moses, "*I am that I am;*" the solemn and frequent form of the Divine protestation, "As I *live*, saith the Lord;" and the no less frequent form of asseveration, "As the Lord *liveth;*" to which may be added the emphatic and commonly occurring phrase, "The *living* God." These formulæ indicate a peculiarity of the Divine nature which is incommunicable, "God *only* hath immortality."

The interpretation, then, of the disputed passage in Genesis, I would submit, may be fairly seen in the following paraphrase: "As yet"—as if the self-communing Creator had said—"we have formed but irrational creatures in this lower creation, without a moral nature, and therefore unaccountable—let us make a creature that shall sustain a moral relation to us, that shall resemble and represent us in this new creation—a creature possessing intelligence, self-consciousness, a moral sense, and capable of a higher enjoyment than other sentient existences—a rational enjoyment—and who shall exercise dominion over the earth, and all that is therein." "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

The assertion that man is not by original constitution an immortal being, obtains, very possibly, an unwilling reception from many whom I have now the pleasure to address. It has been so long a settled point of our belief, and so flattering to human pride, that it may appear to occupy an impregnable position among the credenda of religious doctrines. I cannot also but be aware, that the denial of the natural immortality of man affects other articles of religious teaching, in which the faith of the church has, for many years, unsuspectingly reposed. Nevertheless, with those who seek truth, and who desire not to be the conservators of opinions on the mere ground of their antiquity, the question is—"what saith the scripture?" It does not follow, because during even several centuries a popular belief has

not, except in some few instances, been called in question, that that popular belief is founded in truth. The papacy is a venerable institution, yet Luther was right in his crusade against that system of iniquity, notwithstanding its antiquity, and the confidence and reverence with which it was almost universally regarded. The aged man of three-score years and ten, about to be gathered to his fathers, is right in going to Christ at the eleventh hour of his mortality, and in believing that during the whole of his past long life he has been religiously wrong. Errors, alas! seem more indigenous to our world, and obtain a more tenacious longevity than truth. The progressive development of religious doctrines abundantly proves that the grossest heresies have survived centuries, and been embraced by hundreds of thousands in every succeeding generation; and, notwithstanding, have at last been shown to be but human speculations, or the interpretations of a false criticism. It will not be pretended that we have even now arrived at the *Ultima Thule* of all religious truth, and that to call in question any popular article of faith, or to expect to elicit any new voice from the Word of God, is to exhibit either puerile weakness or daring presumption.

The dogma of the natural immortality of man, it may not generally be known, was *not* the uniform belief of the primitive Church. The history of the Church abundantly proves that the primitive Fathers, so early as the second century, were greatly divided upon this subject. It would appear that up to this time this dogma was not a received article of religious faith, and that its introduction is to be referred to just this period, when Christianity began to number philosophers of the Platonic and Aristotelian schools among her converts; for those who maintained the natural immortality of man did so, not so much on Scriptural, as on *philosophical* grounds. The question was discussed as properly belonging to the region of metaphysics, and the form in which it was held by the polemics of this age depended upon their respective philosophical creeds. Thus, even those who maintained this dogma differed in very material respects; a reasonable consequence of suffering "science falsely so called" to decide what are, and what are not, articles of religious faith. The question was at last settled by the dictum of authority. The Council of the Lateran, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, decreed, that the proper immortality of the soul be a recognized doctrine of religious faith; and from these sources, and not from the teaching of the Bible, we have the doctrine of the natural immortality of man transmitted to the Church as. The Platonism of the second century was the father, and a Lateran Council, under Pope Leo X. in the sixteenth century, was the foster-father, of this so-called Bible doctrine.

That the natural immortality of man should be a most universally held at the present time, will not be a matter of surprise to any one who know how comparatively few they are who really derive their religious faith from the fountain of truth itself. How few obtain the religious doctrines they hold from the Bible, is evidenced by the fact that the great multitude of professing Christians are ill qualified to prove from the Bible the doctrines which they believe it to contain. The great mass form their religious creed from the discourses of their appointed teacher, from catechisms and conversations. Orthodoxy is soon learnt, and its symbols soon adopted; it being like a well-paved highway along which all travel, and the greater proportion not with an intelligent step, as the pathway of their deliberate and reasonable choice, but with a mere mechanical precision. Judaism, the Papacy, and even the Reformed Churches, have taught us lessons about orthodoxy—its history and influence—by which, if we are wise, we shall, by this time, have profited—the chief lesson of which is, that the bible has had *less* to do in the teaching of the Church than many have suspected. Creeds conventionally stereotyped, in which human conceit and a speculative philosophy have lent their mischievous aid, have supplanted the Book of God, and even now, as in our Lord's time, men make void the law of God through their traditions

If we may then judge from the present state of religion, the extremely unsatisfactory aspect of certain great religious questions, and the impotency of the Gospel compared with what, from Scripture promises, we might be led to expect, we shall, I think, conclude that the Gospel of Christ is capable of a presentation to the popular mind far more striking and influential; and that at present it is encumbered with many human admixtures which distract and destroy its moral efficiency. We are not, therefore, to be deterred by the cry of novelty, from an honest and independent inquiry into the meaning of that infallible record, which contains the sayings of "holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" nor are we afraid, while cautiously and prayerfully threading our way, of being led into the labyrinth of dangerous error. We know him who has said, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me;" and who has further taught us, that the Palladium of our faith is not in blindly following the echoes of popular beliefs, and in the prejudiced adherence to systems and creeds, but in studiously and devoutly examining the written Word for ourselves. "Ye do err, *not knowing* the Scriptures."

I repeat, then, that the teaching of the Bible upon the primitive constitution of man—if *that*, and not human speculations and assumptions is to decide what is, and what is not truth—will be found to be this: that man was created a being who, while capable by the power of God, of an unending existence, yet had it not by original constitution; that after his creation he was removed to a particular locality, where the pure pleasures of which, in his first formation, he was alone conscious, might receive their highest gratification—and where, as a moral being, he should be submitted to a state of probation, the success of which should be rewarded by an unending existence, subject to no suffering nor constitutional decay. Whether this probation would have been limited, or extend throughout the whole course of Adam's existence—and what the actual condition of mankind would have been in the event of the successful progress of Adam's probation—it is impossible to say, and it is of little moment to be informed. That the probation would have been confined to our first parent, and that it would have been limited to a definite period, seems highly probable, from the fact that the Divine arrangement constituted him the representative of the human race.

The scene of the trial of our first parent's obedience was a garden, separated from the rest of the earth by a greater luxuriance and attraction, and adapted to minister to his most refined satisfactions and enjoyment. Adam was not created *in* this garden, but was brought thither subsequent to his creation: "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed, (ch. 2: 8;) and which is again repeated in the 15th verse, "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it." In this favored and peculiar place Adam was to enter upon his momentous trial, and to

attain to, or forfeit forever, *immortality* for himself and for generations then unborn.

The terms of the trial are thus stated: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The test was at once simple and easy: it involved, we may presume, no self-denial; it was not likely, amidst so many and such exalted attractions to act as a temptation. Were this even the case, there were counteracting motives far stronger and more influential. Upon the success of the trial depended the highest issues. The reward of his faithfulness was, for himself and his descendants an *unending life*—the only desideratum of his being—the character of which, from his original moral excellence, and the superadded gifts of God, would be a life of blessedness. The punishment of his disobedience was for himself and his descendants—an existence of toil and suffering, exposed to all the contingencies of a native mortality, and then a return forever to the parent dust and original non-existence: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

But it may be asked, does not this penalty imply that Adam was constitutionally immortal, for how otherwise could death be a *punishment* to a being who was created to die? I may reply on the other hand, and with equal reason, by another question; if Adam was created an immortal or deathless being, *how could he die?* It should be borne in mind that Adam was *not created to die, neither was he created to live for ever.* The duration of his existence was left to be determined by himself under a gracious system of moral probation. The penalty was proclaimed to Adam *after he was placed* in Eden. Outside of Eden, that is, before he was placed there, he was a mortal creature. From the moment he entered the garden of Eden he was a candidate for immortality, and was therefore raised above the condition of *necessary* mortality. He had begun to live a life after he was placed in Eden, which, on a certain condition being fulfilled, should never end. He had in fact entered *conditionally* upon his immortality. To Adam therefore, who was a probationer for immortality or a deathless existence, and to whom both life and death were possible, these words, "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," only implied that his immortality was *conditional.* Death, to him who *might have been* forever exempt from its dominion, was, therefore, manifestly a *punishment.*

That the above is the fair exposition of the account given in the sacred history of the probation of Adam, I cannot but think every candid person who is happily unfettered by the dogmas of the common belief, will at once admit. That this exposition greatly detracts from the supposed native dignity of man's constitution, I readily allow; but what is gained by cherishing beliefs, if they are rather fond and flattering conceits, than the instructions of the unerring word of God? If the doctrine of natural immortality be true, it must be proved from the bible; for there, or nowhere, can this doctrine be authoritatively taught.

And if this be not the true explanation of this interesting fact, what, I ask, is the true explanation? If Adam was placed as our representative in Eden, not that he might obtain a *higher good* than he already possessed; if he was merely placed in Eden that he might *run a terrible risk*—the risk of losing something which he *already had;* and not that he might have the advantage and opportunity of gaining something *more* than he already had—then the placing of him in Eden was less an act of grace than the Bible represents it to have been. Indeed, such a representation of the design in placing Adam in the garden of Eden, is incompatible with the evidences of love which the sacred narrative discloses in connexion with this event. "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that *is pleasant to the sight,* and *good for food;* the *tree of life also* in the midst of the garden, and the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil.*" Here, surely, is the enumeration of what was to contribute to our progenitor's highest felicity. Among all the delights which greeted his senses, and which reminded him of the grace of his divine benefactor, was "*the tree of life also* in the midst of the garden, and the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil.*" But the popular representation of the probation of Adam, makes this tree-test a terrible calamity. "The tree of the knowledge of good and evil" stands in the garden-centre, not as the crowning gift of all, as its locality would seem to suggest—giving, while untouched, a right to the tree of life; but as a visible worm at the heart of Adam's many enjoyments. It stands there but to mar, and to be in unsightly contrast with all around. It is in the popular view but a Upas tree, which had already discharged its poison into the fruits which were "good for food," and folded its dark pall over such as were "pleasant to the sight;" instead of a Jacob's ladder, by which the creature of earth might rise to the perfection of an immortal existence.

The two trees, singled out by name, and situated side by side in the centre of the garden, require a more extended consideration. I venture to think, that there was nothing mysterious about these trees; that the names which they bear originated in the arbitrary relation which they sustained in the peculiar Edenic dispensation, and do not characterize their inherent or communicated virtues and capabilities. Their design is sufficiently apparent to guard against any possibility of mistake. The prohibition, it is to be particularly observed, extended to *one* of these trees only, "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil:" "Of *every* tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." This tree was the sole test of Adam's obedience: while he abstained from this, he might eat of every tree in the garden, including of course of *the tree of life.* Now what, we ask, is meant by this "tree of life?" If Adam had already by original creation, *life* in himself, of what use could this tree of life have been to him? It is replied that it had an antiseptic quality imparted to it, and that its design was to preserve the *mortal* part of Adam's nature from decay. But this answer, however plausible, is a *petitio principii*—it assumes what we contend is contrary to the record, that man is, in any sense, *by creation,* an immortal being; and proceeds, moreover, upon the assumption of a compound and conflicting nature of the human constitution, that man is in *part* mortal and in *part* immortal—a strange and unnatural union! Where is it taught in the scriptures that man, in reference to his *soul,* is immortal, but, with respect to his *body,* mortal? Where is this anomalous breaking up, so to *speak,* of the *unity* of man's nature to be found in the Bible? It is not a religious doctrine; but a philosophical refinement, which started into existence when Platonism meddled with the simplicity of the scriptures. Neither the *body* nor the *soul separately* is *the man,* but the *union of both.* To borrow the illustration of a living writer, "as the union of oxygen and hydrogen produces water, so the *union* of body and soul constitutes a man."*

*Rev. E. White, "Life in Christ," p. 24.

Man is always in the bible spoken of as *one*, and as having *one* destination. It is true, by the figure synechdoche, the scriptures often employ the word *soul* to signify the person; as we do, when we say, that such a number of souls perished in shipwreck, or by any other catastrophe; but it is never used in antithesis to the word *body*, as *appropriating the idea of the human personality*. An apparent exception to this may be suggested to some in the language of the preacher, where he says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it;" but this language is rather confirmatory of the opposite view, that *in the disjunction of the constituents of man's conscious being, he ceases to be such a being.* The body, or *the dust* returns "to the earth *as it was*," and the spirit, in like manner returns to God *as it was* before he gave it: not as a *man*, a human personality; for if so, man must have had a conscious existence *before he was born*, but as a *constituent* of the man—the man himself is dissolved.*

And it is in harmony with these remarks that we learn from the bible that the resurrection of the body must precede the judgment of men; and that until the resurrection of the body, the righteous can neither enter upon their reward, nor the wicked pass away into final condemnation. And permit me again to repeat, and to request your particular attention, that Adam after the fall, when in possession of the living, animating principle, is not addressed as the possessor of an *immortal spirit;* it is not his *spiritual nature* which we might have expected, according to the popular belief, that is alluded to, as suggesting the essence of his being; but, on the contrary, his *corporeal* nature, and to this corporeal nature the *personality* and essence of his nature are attached, "Dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return."

The reply that "the tree of life" was placed in the garden of Eden to counteract the native tendency of *one part* of the constitution of Adam to decay, does not, we think, furnish a satisfactory explanation. It represents man as a very *incongruous compound*, as a defective work, to say that one part is inwardly self-sustaining, while the other component part is dependant upon a constant miraculous external agency. In opposition to this view, I would remark, that "the tree of life" in the garden was in the character of a *pledge*. Side by side with the prohibited tree, it was a perpetual check upon the temptation to violate the command by memorializing Adam of the tremendous penalty he would endure for his disobedience. So long as he persevered in his fidelity, he was assured of an immortal existence, and regarded as exempt from suffering and death; there stood the divinely-given pledge of his immortality. While in the garden of Eden, and having access to *that* tree, immortality was guaranteed to him and to his posterity; death had no dominion over him or them. The immortality of Adam, therefore, was *contingent*, not native; it depended upon a particular dispensation and locality—his position in the garden of Eden, and upon the circumstance of his free permission to eat of the 'tree of life' as its guarantee and sign. It was a conditional gift, not a personal possession—the *reward of his obedience*, and not his original constitution.

With this view of the condition of Adam in Eden, all the circumstances of his expulsion from Eden obviously agree. The test having failed, and the melancholy consequences of his disobedience being experienced in the knowledge or consciousness of evil,* purchased at the tremendous cost of a forfeited immortality, Adam is expelled the home of privilege and pleasure. He must now quit the garden of Eden, with its scenes and associations of conscious innocence and joy, and with a guilty conscience and a lost immortality, toil for the subsistence of a brief and sorrowful life, and then, having resigned the breath of his consciousness and animation, dissolve again into his parent dust.

The terms of the original curse most explicitly teach this doctrine, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." That the meaning of this curse is not that Adam should cease to exist in *the very day* that he ate of the forbidden tree, is manifest from the fact that he did not then die. Had this been its signification, we should have been at a loss to account for the *delay* of the punishment, and be unable to explain upon what principle he continued to live so many years afterwards. Now, I would submit that the terms of this curse are quite incompatible with the doctrine of man's constitutional immortality. How could an immortal being die? It is worse than trifling to say that his *body* should die, but that his soul should live; for, in the first place, the body of Adam *did not die* in the day of his transgression; and secondly, if the soul of man is his personality, and the body only a mere instrument for connecting him with and fitting him for this condition of existence—the body, the unconscious tabernacle of the human personality; then, to say that the curse contemplated only the *body* of Adam, that his *body* only should die, is to leave the terrible curse unexecuted; for the curse is, 'in the day that *thou* eatest thereof *thou* shalt surely die,' not thine *unconscious body*, but "thou," thy conscious personality—thyself.

It has been affirmed that the words of the curse, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," imply the *constitutional immortality* of man, because the threat of death pre-supposes the possession of life, which otherwise would not end. But this is rather specious than sound, for all that the words signify is simply that immortality would be a *conditional privilege*. Of course up to the time that Adam violated the command, he continued to live, and would, had he not eaten of the fruit, have lived forever; but *even then*, his immortality would have been *conditional*, and by no means a possession independent of the Edenic dispensation.

This threat must mean something else, and demands a more satisfactory exposition; and what more

*When I say that the human mind is "dissolved," I neither affirm nor imply that the *components* of man's compound being are annihilated. Science teaches that annihilation is impossible, except by the agency of the Creator of all matter; and we have no instance within the range of human knowledge of actual annihilation. Matter may change its form; organic bodies may become disorganized, and be resolved into their primal elements; but the elements themselves exist; and, independently of the Creator's fiat, are indestructible. All that I state in the text is, that since neither the body nor the soul, but the *union of both* is the man, therefore the *disunion* of these constituent parts of man is the dissolution of *the man*. Neither of these constituent parts; that is, neither the *soul* nor the *body* is separately the human personality; their *separate destiny*, therefore, is of no practical interest to our race. The consideration of those passages of scripture, which are supposed to teach the separate existence and conscious personality of the *soul*, I have purposely deferred. For the scripture doctrine on this subject, I refer the reader to "The Generations Gathered and Gathering."

*Jehovah having created man an intelligent and moral being, capable of progressive improvement and happiness, appointed him, for reasons unknown to us, the representative of the whole race which should proceed him; and offered to him, in this representative capacity, the magnificent privilege of an undying existence, on condition that he would acknowledge the divine supremacy, and observe the divine commands. The evidence of this acknowledgment, on the part of the first man, was a sacred abstinence from one particular tree, called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," so called, probably because, according as he obeyed or disobeyed, would be his knowledge or consciousness respectively of good and evil. The recompense of his obedience was, *an unending existence*, the sign and certificate of which was "the tree of life," so called because it was the pledge of the promised life, or immortality. These trees located side by side in the centre of Eden, reminded our representative at once of the condition and the reward.

consistent exposition can be given than that which accords with the view I am now presenting, of the possible, and since the fall, of the real *mortality* of human nature? "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" or, accepting its more literal interpretation, "dying, thou shalt die." In *that very day* in which Adam ate of the tree *he lost the privilege of immortality;* in *that moment* he fell from the sublime possibility of an attainable immortality, and realized the condition possible to his nature—the condition of a mortal, perishable being. Thus and thus only *in* that *very day* Adam *died;* from that time forth immortality to him was an impossible inheritance—from that day the seeds of decay possible to his constitution commenced their desolating growth, and spread in him, and in us all, through him, the desolation of death.* The death threatened was thus a *progressive,* not an immediate death. From the day of his transgression his mortality became a fixed and irreversible fact. Adam was henceforth a dying man travelling onward, not to the realms of the light of life, but to the region of darkness and death.

Now the popular exposition of this curse represents God as declaring that *he will punish* the guilty offender, and *yet not doing so.* If the curse of death here means, as it is said to mean, a *threefold* death, that is, in the popular phraseology—death *temporal,* death *spiritual,* and death *eternal,* then this *threefold* death must have been executed upon Adam, and by consequence upon his posterity, and redemption is necessarily impossible! God had said *thou* shalt die, *not* "thou," or a substitute for thee, but *thou, thyself.* If this threefold death, therefore, is involved in the word "die," then Adam must have been the subject of it, and to *this* death, as "the wages of sin," the whole race is exposed. The animal life is destroyed, the spiritual life is alienated, and *both forever.* How then, on the popular theory, is redemption possible? From an *eternal* death, of course there can be no redemption whatever. But accepting the word "die" in the conventional and evidently scriptural sense of ceasing to exist, then Adam did and does endure this curse, and so do his posterity, and it is from *this* curse that Christ, as "the resurrection and the life," recovers us. *He* has "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light."

The sequel throws additional light upon the nature and consequences of the fall of Adam. Our first parents were immediately expelled Eden; and the reason assigned for their expulsion is as follows: "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken." Gen. 3: 22–23.

In this passage, the expulsion of Adam from Eden is obviously spoken of as a necessity arising out of his altered moral condition, "the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." "To know good and evil" is not necessarily sinful, since God has the most perfect knowledge of these opposite moral qualities. Adam, however, could only have attained this knowledge by an act of disobedience—*he* knew "evil" subjectively, by acquisition and melancholy experience. When Adam therefore had become as God "to know good and evil," it was a proof that he had fallen from his integrity, and that his probation had failed. His knowledge was the evidence of his guilt, which, under his circumstances, he could in no other way acquire than by disobeying the command in reference to "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." It was, therefore, to be deprecated, indeed to be positively forbidden that such a being as Adam had become should have an immortal existence; it could not be permitted that any being should have an inherent immortality who had thus challenged the divine supremacy, and set an example of disobedience to the whole intelligent creation: "And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."

It has already been remarked that it is not necessary to suppose that the tree of life had any miraculous power of conferring immortality; it seems rather to have stood in Eden as the *symbol* and *pledge* of an immortal existence to Adam while he retained his integrity, and the Edenic dispensation continued. Nor does this passage necessarily teach that the fact of Adam's putting forth his hand and taking and eating of the tree of life would have regained and secured to him, in his then altered condition, the immortality which he had forfeited. It is not the *once* eating, but the *habitual* eating of this tree of life which is deprecated and forbidden. So long as he had access to this tree, according to a previously given assurance on the part of God, he was exempt from the contingencies of a mortal nature; it was therefore necessary to send him forth from its neighborhood, since he had forfeited the privileges of which it was the symbol and pledge; and "therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

Now, I confidently appeal to every candid mind, whether this historic relation of the circumstances of Adam's fall is consistent with the belief that Adam possessed immortality as a part of his original constitution? Is it not distinctly proved that he was put into Eden as a probationer for immortality, and, having failed in the trial, is not the assigned reason for his expulsion, the necessity of removing him from "the tree of life?" That sacred enclosure, the happy home of the sinless Adam, was now forbidden ground to him; for he had lost the immortality which his obedience could have gained. The repetition of the reason for his expulsion, and the design, so emphatically expressed, of the cherubims with the flaming sword, "to keep the way of the tree of life," against Adam and his posterity, appear to me absolutely inexplicable upon the supposition that our first father, or ourselves, his posterity, have immortality, or a ceaseless, conscious existence, as an attribute proper and originally belonging to our constitution.

We have been contemplating a humiliating and melancholy fact in the history of our species. If, my brethren, you concur in the simple and, I think, honest reasoning of this discourse, you cannot but, with myself, be humbled on this view of fallen humanity. As we think of man's destiny, we sympathetically exclaim, "How hast thou fallen!" The view which I have now presented differs, it will be observed, from the popular theory, in this respect,

*Dr. Lardner has the following observations upon this passage: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Literally, in the original, "dying, thou shalt die." Which our translators have well expressed, "thou shalt surely die." Hereby some expositors have understood death spiritual, natural, and eternal. But I do not see any good reason they have for it. We seem rather to be justified in taking it in the sense of natural death only, or the dissolution of this frame, the separation of soul and body. We are led to this by the words of the sentence pronounced after the transgression: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." By which may be meant, *that very day thou shalt become mortal, and be liable to pains and diseases which will issue in death.*"—*Essay on the Mosaic Account, &c., Works, Vol.* x. p. 223.

that I have represented the fall of man to be a more extensive calamity than is popularly believed. Man has appeared, in the preceding reasoning, to be more significantly "lost," and more literally in need of being "saved." The popular theory represents mankind to have lost, in their representative, their original holiness and happiness; the theory of this lecture represents this also, but something more than this—man has lost, besides, *immortality* But if I have asked you to look into a gloom so profound, I can point you, on the same divine authority, to a light no less glorious; for "life and immortality," says the apostle Paul, are brought to light by Christ in the gospel. If all in Adam die, on the other hand, all in Christ will be made alive. If the opening book of inspired truth reveals a flaming sword turning every way to defend the approaches to the tree of life, the closing book of inspired truth tells of an obedience which, resulting from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, has power to sheathe the burning weapon, and clear an open way to recover the lost privilege; for "blessed are they," we read, "who do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22: 14. If we have stood in sad mood by the all-engulphing grave and witnessed the sepulture of a lost immortality, we now hear a voice uttering the joyful recovery, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." John 11: 25–26.

LECTURE II.—THE CHRISTIAN REDEMPTION.

"The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 23.

The conclusion to which we came in the last lecture on the important question touching the original and actual constitution of man was, we think, necessitated by the obvious teaching of the sacred narrative. We then saw, after a plain and impartial examination of all the circumstances connected with the creation and probation of the first man, that in consequence of the unsuccessful issue of his trial, as the representative of his posterity, he was exiled from Eden, where was 'the tree of life,' the symbol and pledge of immortality. In that dishonorable banishment was involved the wreck of the moral excellence and immortality of the race.

It is true that we do not derive from the Mosaic account of the fall any very definite information with respect to the precise relation which Adam officially sustained to his descendants; this we learn from other portions of the sacred writings. Thus we read, "If through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 15–17. And again, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." 1 Cor. 15: 21–22. That Adam sustained a representative relation to his posterity, a relation that is wholly distinct from his natural or parental relation, resulting from the divine pleasure and appointment, is supported moreover by the fact that the effects of the fall are entailed upon them even before the period of their moral accountability, as in the case of infants. It is in this view of the correspondence between the fall by representation and the recovery by the same scheme, that the apostle denominates our Lord Jesus Christ the *second Adam*, "the first man Adam was made a living soul," a mere animated existence; "the *last Adam* was made a quickening," or life-giving "spirit." 1 Cor. 15:

"A reason for the representative aspect of the arrangement has been suggested, as brought to light by the representative character of the grand remedial economy which followed. Foreseeing that men, if placed on probation individually, would all incur the penalty of transgression, God was pleased to make their escape from such an issue possible, by the representative arrangement which we have been considering, in order (it has been said) to foreshadow the representative nature of the evangelical economy. The first was, in this particular, a rehearsal of the second. Adam was 'the figure of him that was to come.' 'The gospel was preached before unto Adam.' Now, doubtless the event has disclosed the analogous relation of the first constitution to the second; and inspiration itself affirms a resemblance. And a grand display it presents of the all-related and comprehensive nature of the divine plans. Still we can only regard the analogy supplied as an incidental, not a primary or leading reason for the existence of the economy which supplies it. For, from the moment the first became, in the particular in question, an analogy of the second, the second itself was actually promised. In the same moment in which the shadow appeared, the substance itself was coming into view."—"*Man Primeval*," *by Dr. Harris, p.* 424.

It is of great importance to observe that the divine arrangement which constituted the first Adam the representative of the human race, has entailed upon his posterity exclusively the *effects* of his fall. It is to misconceive and misrepresent the nature of that catastrophe to teach that the entire race, by virtue of this constituted relation, have become *personally guilty* of Adam's sin. The *guilt* of that act of disobedience in Eden was exclusively Adam's; and he alone can, strictly speaking, be said to have been *punished*. What mankind are exposed to in consequence of the fall, is neither the charge of *guilt*, nor the desert of *punishment*, but simply *loss*. The acts of the first man in his representative capacity are participated by his progeny in their *consequences only*, since guilt is not transferable nor hereditary. In correspondence with these remarks, I may quote the language of the late Dr. Payne: "I must again call the reader," he says, "to observe most carefully that our statement is not that *guilt*, in the proper sense of the term, i. e. desert of punishment, rests upon the race in consequence of Adam's sin; nor that the results of his sin overtake us as *punishment*, strictly so called; but that his federal failure has brought upon us legal exposure, or liability to suffer the consequences of that failure; that is, has exposed us to the loss of chartered blessings."—*Con. Lec.*, '*Orig. Sin*,' p. 113.

Now, what were these 'chartered blessings' which Adam might have enjoyed and transmitted to his posterity? I reply, the privilege of an unending existence, or *immortality*, together with such local and conditional circumstances, and the bestowment of such spiritual aid, as should effectually secure the moral and spiritual integrity of the race thus immortalized. In the failure, therefore, of Adam, we read, not the indictment of our own guilt, but the *privation* of such "chartered blessings."

This statement, that we are deprived by the fall, not of personal rights and previous possessions, but chartered blessings, will meet an objection which many feel, and some have even ventured to express. While all admit that the doctrine of Adam's representative relation is distinctly revealed in the Bible, yet, seeing that such momentous issues to the human race are involved in this constitution, it is alleged that such an arrangement has the aspect of injustice towards the race, since it is presumed that their highest interests would have been safer in their own

custody than intrusted to another, and this arrangement being made without the possibility of their being a party to it. Such an objection is of course nothing short of an impeachment of the Eternal Wisdom and Benevolence; and, although the Divine Being needs no apologists for His proceedings, I may be permitted to observe, in the hope of removing this painful and erroneous judgment, that it is based upon the common error of contemplating the fall insulated from the entire scheme, and necessary oneness of revealed truth. Ruin by Adam is not to be regarded *per se*, but in connection with its grand complement—redemption by Christ. The Apostle Paul has, as we have seen, expressed the correspondence between these two great parts of the evangelic system; and has affirmed that mankind are indeed gainers by this original arrangement with Adam, since it became possible to institute a second representative head in the person of Christ, by whom all the lost privileges might be again recovered. "If," he reasons, "through the offence of one, many be dead, *much more* the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is *by one man*, Jesus Christ, hath *abounded* unto many. Where sin abounded, grace *did much more abound;* that as sin hath reigned *unto death*, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord" Ro. 5: 15–21.

This inspired reasoning neutralizes the objection against the representative arrangement, and shows us that every man is *now* his own keeper; and thus, through the new representative relation of Jesus Christ, who has again planted the tree of life, all men are made probationers for immortality; and with a *second* opportunity of being enriched with the forfeited chartered blessings, are challenged to prove themselves worthier and safer guardians of their own interests.

But, independently of this correspondence between the two schemes upon which the fall and recovery of mankind depend, and which exhibit an incalculable over-compensation in the gift of Christ, by which more extensively beneficial ends are generally secured—had no such restoring scheme been devised as that of the Christian redemption, on what principle, we ask, could injustice be charged upon God in the representative arrangement which he made with Adam? "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" Let it be distinctly remembered that the loss mankind sustained in Adam was *not* personal rights, but chartered blessings. This disposition to impeach the justice of the Great Moral Governor arises in part, and I am fain to believe, chiefly from a mistaken apprehension of the nature and consequence of the fall. The most erroneous statements have been made by some writers on this subject. One expositor of the epistle to the Romans maintains, "that the sin of Adam was ours as really and truly so as it was the sin of Adam himself; that every believer is bound to acknowledge and confess that he is *guilty* of Adam's sin;" and that no doubt may be entertained as to the sense in which he employs the word "guilt," he says, "Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity because *it is their sin in reality*, though we may not be able to see the way in which it is so." *Haldane's Com.* v. 1, p. 440.

In harmony with this view of the *actual guilt* of the human race, on account of Adam's transgression, are the popular representations of the desert and punishment of mankind. It is right to observe that there are different views of the nature and effects of the fall; and that in stating what is the popular theory, I may not be stating the theory of many accustomed to reflection upon this subject. The fact, however, that so much, and such wide difference of opinion exists upon this portion of the evangelical system would seem to suggest that there is, somewhere or other, *a wrong element* in the admitted facts, and thus various and unsatisfactory results are arrived at. I think I shall correctly state the popular doctrine when I say that it is believed that Adam, through his disobedience, brought *death* into the world, in this sense—that is, that he exposed his body to dissolution, and his spirit to an unending existence in misery, which terrible heritage, as our representative-head, he transmitted to us, his posterity. I will not here repeat what was said in the former lecture about the unscriptural breaking up of the unity of the human nature, and attaching the essence and personality of the human being to the *spirit*, which this theory developes; but merely ask you to ponder over that thought, and give it its just weight in your reasoning. There are again others who, while they consider that such were the effects of the sin of Adam upon himself, only a *portion* of these evils descend upon the race; this transmitted portion being, the withholding of sustaining grace, condemnation to toil and suffering, and death in the sense of dissolution of the body; the other portion, viz: the eternal suffering of the soul in hell, resulting to the race, as it did to Adam, through *personal* guilt. But you will perceive at once, that if it be admitted that a part of the curse which Adam's disobedience brought upon himself is that his spirit should be punished with eternal suffering then, as the head and representative of the race, he must transmit, not a *part*, but the *whole* of the curse. They who hold this latter theory, evidently revolt from the conclusion to which they see they are fairly and unavoidably brought, although they are very inconsistent in so doing. But they do not escape from the dreaded element of the former theory by any such forced explanation; for if they teach, as they do, that mankind inherit a corrupt tendency from Adam, which will infallibly bring them into this terrible estate, the two theories, apparently different, come to the same point in the end, and that is, that we all inherit from Adam, as the curse of the law, a condition of suffering, followed by the dissolution of the body, and unending misery in hell.

It is not surprising that such representations of the fall should excite, in every reflecting mind, painful and distracting thoughts concerning the blessed God and His moral government. There is, I am disposed to believe, a secret, antecedent condemnation of such a doctrine in the mind of the intelligent inquirer, before any attempt is made to test it by the infallible word; and although I would not attach too much weight to this *a priori* judgment, I would not, at the same time, set it altogether aside as of no weight in the argument. The human mind, even in its unregenerate state, has its perceptions of justice and the fitness of things. The fall, complete as it is, has not obliterated every right perception from the mind—it has less damaged the moral sense than the moral dispositions of the race. The fact that the human mind secretly revolts from such a representation of the consequences of the fall, is at least worthy the careful consideration of those who uphold this theory, and should, we think, induce them to reconsult the inspired record, that they may be satisfied that they have not erred in their convictions of its teaching.

My deliberate opinion is, that the exposition which is very generally given of the fall and its effects is anti-scriptural, and seriously pernicious to the religious interests of mankind, and that the root of the prolific error lies in the assumed doctrine of man's *constitutional immortality*, which, in our last lecture, we saw was not the instruction of the Bible, but the

conceit of a false science. Taking it as an incontrovertible truth, that man is a being composed of a dying body and an undying spirit, the advocates of this theory are unable to dispose of the undying spirit in any other way than to dismiss it to a state of perpetual misery and sin. Of course, it cannot be supposed that the portion of the guilty spirit is one of bliss; the only alternate therefore, is, the supposition that it is consigned to the unending torments of hell. Attempted justifications are not wanting of this awful punishment, which is considered to be due to Adam, and which has become the heritage of his posterity; justifications be it, however, remembered, which are not derived from the bible, but from certain speculative notions about the infinite evil of sin, and the possible necessity of the guilty portion of the intelligent creation enduring a perpetuity of torture in the future state to operate as a moral restraint upon the saved. I cannot understand in what way sin can become infinite, nor can I think that the blessed Jehovah needs to kindle a hell, while the fire of his all-consuming love glows, to enforce and perpetuate hereafter the obedience of his ransomed creatures.

If we interpreted the bible rightly, in our last lecture, we learnt from it that Adam, after his creation, was put into Eden as a probationer for an undying existence, or *immortality;* and that an arrangement was made with him, according to which he should sustain a representative relation to his posterity, by which the *consequence*, not the moral character, of his acts should be visited upon them as well as upon himself. The real consequences of the failure in Eden, and which are transmitted to mankind, are directly *the loss of immortality*, and indirectly of *spiritual integrity*. The condition, character, and prospects of the race are so seriously damaged by the unsuccessful probation of our representative head. The death threatened to Adam was not a *figurative*, nor a *partial*, but a *literal and complete death*. It did not relate to one part only of his nature, but to his nature in its proper and complete *unity;* it contemplated him as *man*. The curse was a condition of suffering, following as a consequence from his altered moral relation to God, to issue in the *decease* of the *man*, which had it been permitted to take its full effect, would necessarily have been the *everlasting extinction* of the human being. The spirit would return to God whence it proceeded, not as the *conscious man*, but as a *component* of the man, and the body to the ground whence it was taken; the *man* by this severance would have been destroyed—his personality, himself, would have been annihilated. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, *thou* [thy personality, thyself,] shalt surely die." Gen. 2: 17.

The actual condition, then, into which the entire human race has been brought through the failure of our first parent, as our divinely constituted representative, in whose image or likeness we are generated, is, according to the Mosaic narrative, an exposure to suffering, issuing in a total decease. "The wages of sin is death"—a final cessation of existence. Man, by his descent from Adam, has inherited this terrible legacy, he has descended from the attainable elevation of an immortal existence, to the inevitable and dishonorable level of the beasts that perish.

Now, if this be the true meaning of the *death* threatened to Adam—if this be *the curse* to which mankind, with their representative, are obnoxious, we should expect to find a phraseology in the scriptures agreeing with this humbling view of the race, in their actual condition, apart from the scheme of recovering mercy. And hence we hear the patriarch Job asking, "What is man that thou shouldst magnify him, and that thou shouldst set thine heart upon him? Are thy days as the days of man? are thy years as man's days? Are not my days few? Cease, then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little; before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 7: 17; 10: 5, 20–22. Again we hear him exclaim, "How much less man, that is a worm? and the son of man, which is a worm?" "Behold, he put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly; how much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth? They are destroyed from morning to evening; they perish forever." Job 4: 18–20. And similar is the language of the Psalmist, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" Ps. 8: 3,4.

In that exqusite composition, the 104th Psalm, which celebrates the wisdom, power, and goodness of God in creation, we meet with a somewhat particular enumeration of the animal kingdom. And in this enumeration, *man* occupies a place without any other distinction than that of a rational being adapting means to ends for the purpose of daily sustenance. "Man goeth forth unto his work, and to his labor, until the evening." The beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, and man are all referred to in exemplification of the grandeur and goodness of God—and of them *all*, not excepting *man* from the general summary, it is added, "Thou hidest thy face, *they* are troubled; thou takest away *their breath*, *they die and return to their dust*. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit [the same word as *breath* in the preceding text] they [*others* like them] are created, and thou renewest the face of the earth." Here, *man* ranks with the inferior animals in their natural destination to the dust of the earth, according to the statement of Solomon, "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast," and his mortality along with theirs is brought into contrast with the eternity of Jehovah. 'The glory of the Lord shall endure forever.' The Psalmist, too, speaks as one sensible of the brevity of his own duration, "I will sing unto the Lord *as long as I live*, I will sing praise to my God *while I have my being*."

These are specimens of the estimate in which the sacred writers held the actual dignity of human nature. Does it not strike you as singularly different from the language which is commonly employed in modern times, in reference to the actual excellence of humanity? It is far from an unusual thing to hear of the human spirit as being incomparably more precious than a universe of worlds; and that, in comparison with it, all material things, however gorgeous and mighty the assemblage, "are less than nothing and vanity."

This language would not be extravagant if it had respect to what humanity *may attain to*, and *may be*, instead of what it *now has* and *is;* if it spoke of its *possible* and *attainable*, instead of its *present* and *actual* worth. In the passage just quoted, David can find no terms to characterize the extreme insignificance of man, when compared with the glory and grandeur of the starry firmament, "*What is man?*" Whence this discrepancy between our modes of thought and speech, and those of the sacred writers? I confess that I cannot explain it, except on the supposition that we have erred in our estimate of what are the real elements of the human constitution; and that man, instead of attaining to the status of angelic nature, is in closer affinity with the worm.

Such a representation is naturally repellant to our feelings—it is designed so to be. The actual degra-

dation of our nature is a part of the conscious bitterness of the curse. We feel that whatever may be said, and however truthful, about our actual alliance with the irrational creation, it is not our proper alliance. We aspire to an equality with angels, and feel that immortality is more germane to our sympathies, and more in harmony with our instincts. But, brethren, what is the truth about our actual condition and prospects? Does the bible teach us that, notwithstanding the fall, we are the imperishable beings that God designed we should be? Has the fall left us immortal or mortal? Has it despoiled us of moral excellence and happiness? and has it not also kept back, in addition, the magnificent bestowment of *immortality?* The bible teaches that the fall is no less extensive and lamentable than this—that mankind, with their gifted capacities, honorable ambitions, and elevated instincts, are nevertheless *lost, dead.* The fall is thus terrible and complete. How bitter is the curse!

It is not unfrequently urged, as an argument for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, that the aspiration for unending existence is universal in the human bosom; and that it is the common belief of the race. The implantation of this instinct in the human constitution, it is argued, proves that the Creator has invested the human soul with the attribute of natural immortality. But this reasoning is rather specious than sound. It is beyond dispute that the love of life is a natural instinct in the human race, but that is a hasty logic which from this premise draws no less than two extraordinary conclusions, viz: the possession of man of immortality or endless life, and the immortality of the soul in particular! If the love of life is a proof that man is naturally immortal, because it is an instinct in human nature, then it is a proof that man, in his compound or complete totality—his *body* as well his soul—is immortal. But the argument, if it may be so dignified, claims only a *fractional* immortality—the immortality of *a part* of the human nature—that of the *soul* as a separate existence! To justify this conclusion it must be first proved that human instincts reside exclusively in the soul, as a separate principle, and are altogether independent on the material organization of man.

But we demur to the conclusion that the love of life, which refuses to be satisfied with a limited existence, is a veritable proof of the possession by man in any sense of natural immortality. If the *desire* for immortality be a proof of the possession of it, then any and every other instinctive desire is a proof that its object or objects are possessed. A juster logic would oblige us to conclude that immortality is a good which the benificent Creator probably designed to bestow on man, and for which man has a possible adaptation. The desire for immortality would make the conscious loss of it a *curse*—and this is chiefly *the* curse which the disobedience of our first father brought on himself and his posterity. The love of life in the heart of man, proves the Gospel of Christ to be the great desideratum of his being, and supplies a mighty subjective motive, to those other motives which the Gospel itself presents, to induce mankind to believe and rejoice in Christ. For the gospel of Christ brings *"life and immortality"* to light. Is it not then, more reasonable to regard this instinctive clinging to life as naturally exciting, under a true scriptural preaching, the conscious bitterness of the loss of it, and that it is mercifully sustained in man, as an auxiliary of religion; that it may act as an impulse to induce him to seek life, and give a willing response to the invitations of him who said "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly?"

There is another specious method of reasoning out the natural immortality of the human soul from the contemplation of man's artistic skill and ingenuity. Here also it may be observed that if the argument is worth anything it must demonstrate the immortality, not of a *part* of man, but of *all* that constitutes man. The mightiest agencies of nature have by human skill been made subservient to the wants and conveniences of the social state. The elements do man's bidding as well as the bidding of God. Surely, it is argued, man, this skilful, powerful being, cannot share the beast's lot! But be it remembered, that all these wonderful achievements are the result of the knowledge, not of essences, but of laws merely; the fruit not of actual creation, but only of a closer inspection of the phenomena of nature. Man in his self-complacency calls his scientific advancements, discoveries, inventions; piety would rather term them revelations, providential disclosures. Let vain man be humbled by the inspired interrogatory, "What hast thou that thou hast not received?" But is the possession of *wisdom* and *power* to be accepted as an argument of man's eternal longevity! Because man has skill and ability, is he therefore immortal? We in our ignorance and imperfection would exalt the intellectual above the moral. The former has greater attractions for imperfect man than the latter. Had *we* the peopling of Paradise, we should fill it with the world's heroes in literature, science, and the arts. The skilful are the world's saints, and the proper candidates for heaven's "many mansions." This argument, dispassionately considered apart from the imposing parade of human achievements, is just this: Man is *clever,* therefore he is *immortal?* Here is neither logic nor religion. The cleverness of man is surely no title to immortality, much less is it the proof of its possession. It is a silly logic, which asserts human immortality from such strange premises as balloons and pyramids, electro-telegraphs and railways. How true is it that "man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart!" A virtuous heart, rather than a skilful head, were a proof of immortality. But man will search in vain for the evidences of his own natural immortality. Immortality is "the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Let not man therefore unduly exaggerate his skill, nor seek therein an argument for his immortality, but remember that immortality is a Gospel reward bestowed not on intellectual but moral considerations: as it is written, into "that great city, the holy Jerusalem, there shall in nowise enter anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life."

The exposition of the fall and its effects, as previously exhibited, is capable of being put yet further to the proof. As a part, and a fundamental part, of a great system of revealed truth, it must accord, if it properly belong to that system, with every other part; and if it does so, obviously, and without labored and unnatural interpretations, will evince its claim to be so regarded. "We may observe," says a living writer, whose observation, though it has a special reference, is applicable as a general rule of sound exposition—"we may observe that an interpretation, besides being thus in accordance with its context, must be so without any very violent means being applied to bring it into such agreement; even as, generally, the interpretation must be easy, if not always easy to be discovered—yet, being discovered, easy. For it is here, as with the laws of nature; the proleptic mind of genius may be needful to discover the law; but, being discovered, it throws back light on itself, and commends itself unto us all. And there is this other point of similarity also; it is the proof

of the law, that it explains all the phenomena, and not merely some—that, sooner or later, they all marshall themselves in order under it; so it is tolerable evidence that we have found the right interpretation * * if it leave none of the main circumstances unexplained. A false interpretation will inevitably betray itself, since it will invariably paralyze, and render nugatory, some important member of an entire account. If we have the right key in our hand, not merely some of the wards, but all will have their corresponding parts; and, moreover, the key will turn without grating or overmuch forcing; and if we have the right interpretation, it will scarcely need to be defended, and made plausible with great appliance of learning, to be propped up by remote allusions to Rabbinical or profane literature, by illustrations drawn from the recesses of antiquity."—*Trench, Notes on the Parables of our Lord, pp.* 37, 38.

If, therefore, the fall of man be as extensive as I have represented, the recovery will be co-extensive with it, and the redemption by our Lord Jesus Christ, which is revealed in the Scriptures, will be found to adapt itself to the alleged extremity in which mankind are placed.

I proceed to observe, that the redemption needed by man, and which Christ would therefore accomplish, is redemption, not from the moral dominion of sin only, though this was an important part of the scheme of infinite benevolence, for Christ "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity;" Titus 2: 14; but also redemption from *death* in the sense of a positive decease; and union with him, as the second Adam, sustaining a representative relation to us, would recover for us all that had been lost by the first Adam. Among other losses, through the failure of the first Adam, was the magnificent gift of eternal life; and what is the gift which, through Christ, is restored to the believer? Our text answers the question, "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

But here a question arises which must be answered before we can arrive at any certain and satisfactory results. What is the meaning of the words *life* and *death* in the Bible? The question has an important bearing upon the argument of this discourse and if we do not agree in the meaning which we suppose these words to have, it will be impossible to consent in any conclusion. It should seem strange that such a preliminary question is needed; for what ought more reasonably to be conveyed by these terms than those ideas which, in conventional usage, are always associated with them? I do not believe that this question would ever have been asked, but for the error into which the great bulk of professing Christians have been led in reference to the native constitution of man. Believing that man is an immortal being, it is seen to be impossible to understand the terms *life* and *death*, in their application to him, in any other than a *figurative* sense. A being who believes that he has life already by original creation, in the sense of an unending or immortal existence, is necessitated to understand the promise of life as synonymous with the promise of happiness; and when death is predicated of such a being, it also must be understood in the metaphorical sense of misery, since it is presumed that this native immortality will never be alienated. Does not this conversion of the most common-place terms, from their familiar and natural use, to a use both unfamiliar and unnatural, appear, to say the least, a very singular circumstance? If the language in which the original Scriptures were written could not furnish terms to express the ideas of happiness and misery, then there might be some plausibility for the appropriation of these terms in this arbitrary sense. But the rudest language has its signs for these ideas; and, therefore, there could have been no need, and we should think, too, no reason to set aside the appropriate words, and to employ others in a sense so different from their peculiar signification. Thus employed, the words *life* and *death* part with their proper and distinctive signification; and one term especially—the term *death*—is employed in a sense the very opposite of its original and conventional meaning; *death*, according to the popular theory, is made to signify a *life of misery!*

Now, there are grave objections against this figurative use of the words *life* and *death*. In the first place we have seen they have a very arbitrary and unnatural meaning forced upon them. And in the second place, the conversion of these words from their proper to a very violent and arbitrary meaning, has no authority from nor is it demanded by the written Word.

The Bible, professing to be the teacher of mankind in religion, the most interesting and important of subjects, would, of course, not construct a terminology of its own; but make use of the language which the people understood, and employ the terms of such language in their current and conventional meaning; and whenever it was necessary to employ a word different from its customary usage, either the context would make this apparent, or there would be some cautionary observation to prevent the possibility of mistake. All language is, more or less, figurative; and of all imaginations, the oriental is the most imaginative; and, therefore, it was to be expected, that words would not invariably be used in their strict primary signification; but whenever it should be necessary to employ a word in an unusual sense, there would be ample evidence of its new appropriation. Should there be any danger of misunderstanding the sense in which a word is used, especially if upon that word depended important doctrine, then we might expect such a cautionary notice of its new meaning, as is furnished, for example, in the book of Revelation, ch. 2: 8, where Jerusalem is called "Sodom and Egypt," and we are carefully informed that it it so called "spiritually.' [See also another example in John 7: 38–39.] But the words in question have no such admonitory notice, which is the more surprising since such a usage of them, as the scriptures are alleged to furnish, is contrary to all custom; and being employed to teach very vital doctrines, such an admonition is the more necessary, and to be expected. The fact that the Bible has no inspired glossary or explanation of terms, renders it the more imperative that all its words should be employed according to established usage; and is in itself a tacit proof that such *is* the sense in which every word is used. I conclude, therefore, that the words *life* and *death*, as used in the bible, are to be understood in the same sense they obtain in ordinary language—that is, except when obvious reasons demand a figurative meaning for them—in their plain, literal, conventional signification—not respectively happiness and misery, but *existence* and *non-existence.*

A passage occurs in Paul's Epistle to the Romans of considerable importance in the controversy touching the meaning of the term *life*, when used to express the reward of the righteous. "For to be carnally-minded is death, but to be spiritually-minded is *life* and *peace.*" Rom. 8: 6. Here the term "peace," equivalent to the term *happiness*, is employed by the Apostle in *addition* to the term *life* If life means happiness, then Paul is guilty of an unmeaning tautology—for the element of peace is inseparable from the idea of happiness, and would on this supposition be comprehended or expressed by the term *life.* The occurrence of the two words *life* and *peace* in this text

is demonstrative of the literal usage of the former term. And therefore if *life* is to be understood in a literal sense, its opposite, *death*, must be understood in a literal sense also.

The view which we derived from the Bible of the condition of fallen man, as having lost the privilege of unending life, makes it the more obvious that the term *life* is needed in its primary and literal sense. The loss which Adam has entailed upon mankind, is the loss of *life*, therefore the *promise* of *life*, not in the figurative sense of happiness, but in its own literal meaning of *existence*, is what is needed as the blessing conveyed by the gospel scheme. We cannot understand in what sense the Gospel of Christ can be considered a scheme for restoring to man what he lost in the fall, if it omit to mention among its chartered blessings, the offer to man of *life* or *immortality*. But this it does; 'for the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

According to the historic account in the book of Genesis, Adam, as the representative head of the race, failed to secure this distinguished boon, and the proof of it is furnished in the assigned reason for his expulsion from Eden—"And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden. * * So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way to *keep the way of the tree of life.*" Gen. 3: 22–24. He is, with studied emphasis, condemned to an absolute *decease*, by the dissolution of his compounded nature as *man*—his "breath of life" being resumed by his Maker, and his body left to decompose into its original dust. His mortality is characterised in terms the most definite and unmistakeable—"dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;" it is *not* his body that is thus characterised, but *himself;* the conscious man is not associated with the higher element of his compound nature, but with the *visible material form*—"dust *thou* art, and unto dust *thou* shalt return."

Accept these words, then, in their proper significancy; divest your mind of the philosophic conceit that the nature of man, either before or after the fall, is *essentially immortal*, and you remove a veil which greatly obscures the whole system of revealed religion. Let it be clearly perceived by you that mankind, by virtue of the representative headship of their first progenitor, have lost the magnificent inheritance of *immortality*, and you will see how appropriate to our fallen and degraded condition is the language of the Gospel, which assures us that Christ "has abolished death, and has brought *life* and *immortality* to light." 2 Tim. 1: 10.

The popular view of the theory of redemption is briefly as follows: Man, it is asserted, was at his creation endowed with immortality, and that this attribute is as proper to his nature as his reason, or his moral sense; that through the failure of his representative he is despoiled, *not* of his immortality, but of his original spiritual excellence; and, being deprived of the favor of God, is exposed to an *immortality of misery;* that the redemption of Christ, so far as regards man, rescues him from his merited destination to *the unending torments of hell;* and, by laying the foundation, and effecting the superstructure of his spiritual character, fits him for "the inheritance of the saints in light." Now, I contend, that this theory is but a partial statement of the Bible theory of human redemption; that, taken as a whole, it is a very erroneous statement, without the proof of a single passage, or any assemblage of passages of Scripture; that it does to the system of Christian truth what he would do to the solar system who should think that it was more complete and attractive without its central sun. If any fact of Scripture revelation is more prominent than another, it is this, that the human race is, through Adam, doomed to a literal and complete *decease*, and that our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world to save the race from *this* death. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Recal to mind the phraseology in which the New Testament describes a chief benefit of Christ's mediation, and you will find that its distinguishing and emphatic language is *life* and *eternal life.*

Let it be distinctly understood that this lecture is confined exclusively to the consideration of *one*, and *only one* purpose of the Mediator's mission. That mission of divine beneficence contemplated other great objects than the *redemption* of the race, which more especially denotes the recovery of mankind from death. The mission of Christ contemplated important moral ends also, and the Mediator had much to accomplish before he could say, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Jesus Christ is "made unto us wisdom and righteousness (or justification,) sanctification and redemption." Mankind had lost the image of God in themselves, and the conceptions of Him by the Jew, as well as by the Gentile, were erroneous and grovelling. Christ came therefore, to manifest the unseen and unknown Jehovah, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "Henceforth ye *know* Him and have *seen* Him." Thus Christ is "made unto us *wisdom.*"

The consciousness of guilt disposed our race to blot out the memory of God's existence, for mankind dreaded, and sought by forgetfulness to flee from, His presence. Christ came, therefore, to preach forgiveness of our sins—to assure the self-condemned race that "there is forgiveness with God," and to conciliate their alienated hearts by declaring that God does not impute sin where there is repentance and faith. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Hence, Christ is "made unto us *justification.*" The moral condition of mankind was another gulf of separation between them and their Maker. As sinful beings the holy Jehovah could not have fellowship with them, and as such, they had no desire for fellowship with God. Christ, therefore, came to reform the moral character of mankind—he came to "take away their sins" by purifying "unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Hence Christ is "made unto us *sanctification.*" Besides these great purposes of the Mediator's mission, there was yet another purpose to be accomplished, without which all the foregoing benefits of the Mediatorship would have been but imperfect and temporary. The race of man is *mortal.* "Death has passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Christ came, therefore, that he might "abolish death, and bring life and immortality to light." "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that *we might live through him.*" 1 John 4: 9. Hence Christ is "made unto us redemption."

Now, this grand purpose of the mission of Jesus Christ, to bestow a future and endless life on all to whom his manifold mission has been personally efficacious, necessarily supposes that the human race are mortal, in such a sense as that death has complete dominion over them, and that the state of death is an absolute non-existence of the conscious life of the human being. "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the grave?" Ps. 89: 48. "The wages of sin is

death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It remains for me to prove that the view I have given of the Christian redemption is the obvious instruction of the Christian scriptures; and this I proceed to do by showing, first, what is the testimony of the New Testament writers concerning Christ as the medium of everlasting life to man; and then, by collecting concurrent evidence furnished in the personal teaching and history of our Lord himself. The amount of evidence furnished by the New Testament is very large; and, therefore, instead of gathering it together in one vast mass, I will distribute it in corroboration of the three following propositions respectively: 1. Immortality is not in any sense possessed by man as a native element in his constitution, but is bestowed as a gift by God through his Son Jesus Christ. 2. The bestowment of this gift is at the time of the resurrection from the dead, at the second coming of Christ. 3. Its bestowment is upon the faithful in Christ only.

The following is the apostolic testimony to the truth of our first proposition—that,

1. Immortality, or endless life, is not a natural property of the human constitution, but is the gift of God bestowed through Jesus Christ.

"In him was life, and the life was the light of men." John 1: 4. "Ye killed the Prince of life." Acts 3: 15. "To those who seek for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life." Rom. 2: 7. "Even so might grace reign to eternal life by Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 21. "The gift of God is eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 6: 23. "O man of God, lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6: 12. "In hope of eternal life which God promised before the world began." Tit. 1: 2. "Made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Titus 3: 7. "Our hands have handled of the word of life. For the life was manifested, and we have seen it and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." 1 John 1: 1–2. "This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life." 1 John 2: 25. "This is the record, that God hath given to us, eternal life, and this life is in his Son." 1 John 5: 11. "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life; and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." 1 John 5: 13. "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." 1 John 5: 20. "Beloved, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Jude 21. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye yourselves also to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 8–11. "We shall live with him by the power of God." 2 Cor. 13: 4. "Our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." 1 Thess. 5: 10. "Shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 17. "The free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Rom. 5: 18. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. 8: 2. "That mortality might be swallowed up of life." 2 Cor. 5: 4. "Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 3–4. "Paul an apostle, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 1: 1. "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1: 10. "There ariseth another priest (Christ) who is made after the power of an endless life." Heb. 7: 16. "Being heirs together of the grace of life." 1 Pet. 3: 7. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give to him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely." Rev. 21: 6. "That in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting." 1 Tim. 1: 16. "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, *ye might have life through his name.*" John 20: 31.

The foregoing array of passages taken only from the apostolic writings of the New Testament are amply sufficient to indicate the apostolic doctrine on this point. No considerate person can question the proposition which they have been collected to establish, viz: that mankind are in no sense immortal beings, but that immortality is a blessing of the gospel, a gift of God, bestowed through our Lord Jesus Christ. If it be asked, how is immortality bestowed *through* Jesus Christ, I reply, because Christ is the medium of all God's blessings to mankind—he is the one medium or Mediator between God and man. The revelation of God, and the communication of all his benefits is by means of an intervening party or Mediator, through whom alone we know God, and are made partakers of his grace. We obtain immortality *through* Christ, because he is exalted to be the Prince or Author of life; even as we obtain repentance and remission of sins *through* Christ, because "he is exalted to give repentance and remission of sins." The sacred Scriptures reveal the fact that the manifestation of God is mediatorial, and as Christ is that exalted personage who fulfils the office of the Mediator, every communication of God, in the way of knowledge, promise, and gift, is necessarily *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.

We now proceed to the second proposition.

2. That immortality, or everlasting existence, is introduced by and dependant upon the resurrection from the dead at the second coming of Jesus Christ.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively (living) hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, *reserved in heaven for you;* who are kept by the power of God through faith unto *salvation* (which is) *ready to be revealed in the last time.* * * At the appearing of Jesus Christ. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" 1 Pet. 1: 3–5, 7–13. "Jude, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and *preserved in Jesus Christ.*" Jude 1. "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, (which is called also the *'incorruptible* crown, 1 Cor. 9: 25; 'the crown of *glory* that fadeth not away.' 1 Pet. 5: 4, and also 'the crown of life.' Rev. 2: 10.) Henceforth, then, says Paul, there is laid up for me the crown of immortality, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me *at that day*, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love *his appearing.* 2 Tim. 4: 6–8. "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him *against* that day." (the day of his appearing.) [This will explain what the dying Stephen meant when he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" be thou the guardian of my life, and let it, in common with the life of all thy saints, be "hid with" thee in God, for thou art "our life:" and when he said this, *he*, the personality Stephen, "fell asleep."] 2 Tim. 1: 12. "*When* Christ, who is *our life* shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 4. "We groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Rom. 8: 23. "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection. * * If I may but attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 10–11.

Paul consoled the Thessalonian believers concerning their dead friends who had died in the faith, by assuring them that they should rise from the dead, when Christ came again. 1 Thess. 4: 13–18.

"If there be no resurrection of the dead * * * then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." 1 Cor. 15: 13–14. "If there be no resurrection of the dead * * then they which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15: 18. "If the dead rise not at all, why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" 1 Cor. 15: 30. "Else what shall they do who are baptised for the dead if the dead rise not at all? *why* are they then baptised for the dead?" 1 Cor. 15: 29. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." 1 Cor. 15: 32. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Which is, when we are raised in our spiritual bodies at the time of resurrection. 1 Cor. 15: 50.

The fact that there is no future life but by means of a resurrection from the dead, and that the resurrection depends upon the second personal advent of Christ, will explain why the apostles were preachers of the resurrection from the dead—why they groaned for and earnestly desired the resurrection of the dead; why they preached so much about the second coming of Christ; exhorted and persuaded their converts by the prospect of that event, and anticipated with so much enthusiasm the speediness of its approach. If Christ do not come again as the "Resurrection and the Life," to raise the dead—then is our faith vain—Christian preaching is vain—they who have fallen asleep in Christ are *perished.* Can language more

clearly express the truth, that if there be no resurrection, there is no future life? I remark thirdly—

3. That immortality, or endless existence, is the peculiar privilege of the regenerate; that is, in other words, that *none* but believers in Christ are immortal.

"Seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Acts 13: 46. "Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6: 22–23. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Gal. 6: 8. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3: 15. "To be carnally-minded is death, but to be spiritually-minded is life and peace." Rom. 8: 6. "The Spirit is life because of righteousness." Rom. 8: 10. "Henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind. * * being alienated from the life of God." Eph. 4: 18. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." 1 Tim. 4: 8. "He shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." Jas. 1: 12. "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." 1 John 5: 12. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life." Rev. 22: 14. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Rom. 8: 13. "Yield yourselves unto God as those who are alive from the dead." Rom. 6: 13. "There is therefore no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. 8: 1–2. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Rom. 5: 17. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." 1 John 3: 14. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 36.

In accordance with this representation of the exclusive privilege of immortality belonging to believers in Christ, is the scripture revelation concerning the two resurrections. "The first resurrection," as it is called, is distinguished as the 'resurrection unto life,' and is exclusively 'the resurrection of the just.' The second resurrection is denominated 'the resurrection unto damnation'—and is described as 'the second death'—and this is the awful portion of unbelievers. 'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first resurrection*, on such the *second death hath no power*.' Rev. 20: 6.

In the foregoing citations is exhibited the testimony of the New Testament writers to the fact that immortality, or endless life, is a blessing peculiar to the Gospel, and that Jesus Christ, as the Mediator, is the dispenser of this distinguished boon. We have also seen that the gift of everlasting life is bestowed at the time of the resurrection, when Christ comes the second time for salvation—and that he bestows it only upon those whose faith in himself had justified and sanctified them, and made them "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." It now remains to examine the personal mission of Christ, as recorded in the histories of the Evangelists, that we may see whether our Lord's testimony accords with that of his apostles; whether he represented it as one chief purpose of his mediatorial mission, to announce the gift of life at the time of resurrection, and himself as the medium of its communication.

"As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 25–29. "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." Matt. 19: 29; Mark 10: 30; Luke 18: 29–30. "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life." John 4: 14. "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." John 5: 24. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, (the second death.) but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. 25: 46. "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." (Christ's allusion to the multitudes of Samaritans coming out to meet him.) John 4: 36. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." John 5: 39. "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5: 40. "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10: 10. "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you, for him hath God the Father sealed." John 6: 27. "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." John 6: 33. "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." (Here our Lord taught the future life through resurrection.) John 6: 39. "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 40–44. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John 6: 47. "I am that bread of life." John 6: 48. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." John 6: 49–50. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever: and the bread that I shall give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John 6: 51. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6: 53. "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 54. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." John 6: 57. (The peculiarity of the phraseology in this and other verses of this chapter, arises from the carrying out of the figure of "bread," to which our Lord compared himself, and hence naturally spoke of *eating* himself, as the "bread of life," to convey the idea that life or immortality was derived exclusively from him.) "This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever." John 6: 58. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." John 8: 51. (i. e. death absolute; the death that is to be followed by resurrection our Lord called "sleep;" that is properly death, from which there is no waking or resurrection, which will be the character of the 'second death.') 'I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8: 12. "I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, (though he die,) yet shall he live, (i. e. again.) And whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." (Literally "shall not die forever.") John 9: 25–26. "Jesus saith, I am the way, the truth, and the life—no man cometh unto the Father but by me." John 14: 6. "Because I live, ye shall live also." John 14: 19. "I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish." John 10: 28. "He that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." John 12: 25. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John 17: 2–3. "The Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life." John 12: 49–50. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Rev. 2: 9. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. 2: 10.

These passages, all of which are selected from the recorded discourses of our Lord, place it beyond all reasonable doubt, that a chief purpose of Christ's mission was to proclaim the offer of immortality, or endless life, by means of resurrection from the dead; and through himself as the life of men.

The miracles of our Lord, wrought as they were in his own name, and because he had "life in himself," may be regarded as illustrating his high prerogative, as 'the Prince of life.' The three recorded miracles of raising the dead exhibit a gradation in the condition of the deceased which it is interesting to notice, and which demonstrates the complete dominion of Christ over hades, the state or place of the dead, of which he is represented as holding the keys. 1 Rev. 1: 18.

The first miracle of raising the dead was on the youthful daughter of Jairus, who had died since her father had gone to supplicate the aid of Christ. She had but just expired when Christ entered the house, and re-animated her by his life-giving voice.

The second miracle of this nature, which exhibits a stage in advance of the former, was on the son of a

widow who was being borne on the funeral bier to his tomb.

The third and yet farther advanced state of decease, was in the person of one who had lain in the tomb four days, upon whom corruption had begun its work; but, at the bidding of the Life-giver, corruption was checked and repaired, and the dead Lazarus came forth.

The personal resurrection of Christ, is the most wonderful illustration of the fact so emphatically asserted by him, that "the Son hath life in himself." In our Lord's appearance to John in Patmos, he thus significantly reports himself, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore." To this event he always referred as the pre-eminent sign which he would give to the sign-seeking Jews, that he was their Messiah. "Destroy (ye) this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." He spake of the temple of his body. "No man taketh my life from me, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." And it is deserving special consideration, that in the Apostolic age, there was erected a grand monument of this stupendous event in our Lord's history, in the institution of the Christian Lord's day. The seventh day, Sabbath, the most ancient of all institutions, whose antiquity was coeval with the completion of the terrestrial creation, yielded up its sacred claim of weekly celebration, to the *first day* of the week, for the distinguished reason, that on that day Jesus Christ arose from the dead, as the Head of a new and imperishable Creation. The doctrine of our Lord's resurrection occupies a very observable prominence in the Christian system, as revealed in the New Testament, which contrasts remarkably with the subordinate position which it is made to occupy in the modern Christian instruction. Many modern expositors, indeed nearly all, consider this fact rather in the light of a *dependant* circumstance than the grand circumstance itself. The resurrection of Christ is commonly referred to as if its chief use were to prove the divine authority of his Messiaship, whereas the Apostles suspend upon it the salvation of mankind.

Paul thus reasons: "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15: 20, 17–18.

There is a very significant circumstance connected with the personal history of Christ, which demands our attention. Among the supernatural events which occurred on the occasion of the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord, we are informed "the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves, after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." Matt. 27: 51–53. It is universally agreed, that the several prodigies on these memorable occasions were emblematical and significant of some of the primary truths of the Christian system. The mysterious noon-day darkness, the rending of the temple-veil, and the opened graves, announce important truths in connection with the mission of Christ. The specialty which marks the narrative of this latter event is most suggestive. The death of Christ shook in emblem the whole empire of death, when rocky sepulchres were rent asunder, and the dark chambers of the dead laid bare their mouldering contents. Still, however, the tenants of the grave slumbered on, unconscious of this prelude to the mighty revolution, which was yet to be affected in the dominions of death. The death of Christ had thus given a symbolic promise big with assurance to the captive dead, but nothing more. That event enveloped the earth in a simultaneous darkness, and but for the "earthquake" of promise would have suggested the failure of the Mediator's enterprise, and the destruction of the world's resurrection hope. The three days' duration of the death of Christ was the proudest moment of Death's dominion. It was "the hour of darkness." That supernatural gloom that spread over Jerusalem at the moment Christ bowed his head in death, fitly shadowed forth the melancholy wreck of human hope, if it were "possible that he should be holden of death." The *death* of Christ therefore was but *promissory* with regard to the accomplishment of victory over death. It remained for the resurrection of Christ to complete this mightiest conquest Hence when Christ had burst the bands of death, these dead tenants of the opened sepulchres revive too, and come out of their graves, enter the city of Jerusalem, and appear to many that probably knew and recognized them. Now why, I ask, was this preternatural event permitted at this special time, if it were not to furnish an actual representation of this one great purpose of the Mediator's mission, "that the world might *live* through him." Why are we told that it was not until "*after* his resurrection" that these dead ones "arose, and came out of their graves," but that we should be reminded of the fact that life or immortality, by means of resurrection from the dead, is *through* Christ who is "the first-begotten from the dead." And why, I would further ask, are we expressly informed of the fact that only "*the saints* which slept arose," but that we should have an extraordinary illustration in fact, of what our Lord and his disciples so frequently affirmed, that only saints or holy persons, should have everlasting life. "He that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "I am the resurrection and the life."

The conquest of death by our Lord is celebrated in the Scripture in language which must be acknowledged to be *extravagant*, and beyond the greatness of the theme, if the death of the body is all the literal death, which, through Adam, is entailed upon the race—the *body* which, according to the popular theory is a mere appendage to the man, and *not* the man himself. Paul, in his rapturous contemplation of the victory of Christ, thus exclaims, "*death* is swallowed up in victory! O *death* where is thy sting? O *grave* where is thy victory?" This pæan of the Apostle is over the so-called tabernacle, the dispensable tenement, and as we are sometimes assured, the gross prison-house, of the man! Did the contemplation of Christ's victory in behalf of mankind suggest no vaster theme for the evokement of his pious transport than this? Why does he triumph over the *grave*, and not over *gehenna*, the burning hell of the condemned? Surely the liberation of the self-conscious spirit from the alleged doom of unending torment supplies a worthier occasion for triumphant ecstasy, than the mere deliverance of the unconscious *body* from the corruption of the grave! If Paul did not think so, the modern church does. Hear her voice, in her accredited psalmody:

"Plunged in a gulf of dark despair,
We wretched sinners lay;
Without one cheering beam of hope,
Or spark of glimmering day.

With pitying eyes the Prince of grace
Beheld our helpless grief;
He saw, and, O amazing love!
He ran to our relief.

These are the wounds for you I bore,
The tokens of my pains,

When I came down to free your *souls*
From misery and chains.]

He spoiled the powers of darkness thus,
And broke our iron chains;
Jesus hath freed our captive souls
From *everlasting pains.*

He raised me from the deeps of sin,
The gates of gaping *hell;*
And fixed my standing more secure
Than 'twas before I fell.

Oh, for *this* love, let rocks and hills
Their lasting silence break,
And all harmonious human tongues
The Saviour's praises speak."

Here is an obvious difference between apostolic and post-apostolic views of the benefits of redemption. Paul rejoices in "the redemption of the body" from corruption. The modern church rejoices in the redemption of 'captive souls from everlasting pains.' The apostle is absorbed, in the contemplation of Christ's victory over death and the grave. The church views this victory as over the burnings of 'gaping *hell.*' The contrast is no more obvious than remarkable, and is altogether inexplicable on the supposition that Paul believed and taught the doctrine of the soul's separate state of existence, and immortality. It is not over hell, the place of endless torment, but over the power of death, and its prison-house, the *grave,* that the apostle erects himself in holy triumph! Look with Paul into the grave, and see therein the sepulchre of the conscious humanity, and you will participate in his grateful enthusiasm, as you contemplate the conquering Immanuel, leading captivity captive.

It has been observed that the doctrine of our Lord's resurrection occupied a position of prominence in the teaching of the apostles, which it certainly does not obtain in the popular theology of the day. No one was even suitable for the apostolate, however eminent might be his piety and gifts, if he could not bear personal testimony to the truth of Christ's resurrection: it was expressly provided that an apostle should be able to say that he had seen the Lord Jesus after his resurrection. Acts 1: 21–22. Paul speaks of himself as 'one born out of due time' in reference to his call to the apostleship after Christ's ascension, yet he could vindicate his title as an apostle of Christ. "Am I not an apostle?" he asks his Corinthian converts, "have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" See also 1 Cor. 15: 5–8. Peter thus argues in his first sermon to the Jews on the day of Pentecost: David "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne—he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in *hades*, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." Acts 2: 29–32. In the following passage we learn what was the grand theme of the apostles' preaching: "As they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead. And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all." Acts 4: 1–2, 33. When the philosophers at Athens wanted to be informed concerning the Christian doctrine, Paul preached unto them resurrection from the dead through Jesus Christ, which gave considerable offence, and ended in his abrupt dismissal by them. Acts 17: 18–32. I would ask, if this prominence which was given to the doctrine of Christ's resurrection from the dead, by the first teachers of Christianity, is not at least very remarkable, compared with the subordinate relation which in modern preaching it sustains to some other parts of the evangelic system? Does it not justify, or at least help to strengthen the conclusion that there is a part of the evangelic system which is wanting in the theology of the nineteenth century? I think this conclusion is irresistible. What that part is, is the object of this lecture to show, viz: that life or immortality is only to be had through Christ, whose personal resurrection from the dead is the evidence and pledge of our own. It is *he* who bids the cherubim sheathe the flaming sword, and leave an open door to "the tree of life." "To him that overcometh, will *I* give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

The grand distinguishing doctrine of the Christian redemption is, *Eternal Life in Jesus Christ alone*—the free gift of sovereign grace, and appropriated by faith. In every part of the system of revealed religion we see evidences of this fundamental doctrine. Life in Christ is among the chief doctrines of the bible. It was promised to our first parents after the fall in the then obscure language, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" and the ancient and elaborate ritual of the Levitical dispensation derives much of its significance from this promised fact. The ceremonial *prohibition* to *eat the blood*, furnishes an interesting and conclusive argument in support of the doctrine, that immortality is *not* an attribute of human nature, but is the gift of God through Jesus Christ. In the 9th chapter of Genesis, 3d and 4th verses, we have the statement of this prohibition to Noah, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things; but flesh with the *life* thereof, which is the *blood* thereof, *shall ye not eat.*" This prohibition was repeated with still greater emphasis under the subsequent economy of religion. "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that *eateth any manner of blood*, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the *life* of the flesh is in the *blood;* and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. For it is the *life* of all flesh; the blood of it is for the *life* thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the *life* of all flesh is the blood thereof; whosoever eateth it shall be cut off." Lev. 17: 10, 11, 14.

One reason of this prohibition to make use of blood is assigned in the last quotation—"the blood maketh atonement," or reconciliation. The prohibition to eat blood, then, was because of its sacred ceremonial appropriation. But it seems to have had another reason, viz: that it might operate as a memorial to the ancient worshippers, to humble them in the assurance that they had *no life* in themselves—that their immortality was forfeited. It was of great importance to assure the Israelite, and all mankind through him, that he was judicially *dead.* Hence every animal that was slain for daily food was to be drained of the blood. This command to a people familiar with the method of instruction by symbolic actions, was most obvious in its humbling meaning—it told them, and the intelligent worshipper understood the voice, *Ye are mortal.* The blood poured upon the ground to mingle with the dust, showed them *whither* was their destiny, that from the ground they were taken, and thither, unransomed, they would for ever return. "He shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust." Lev. 17: 13. "Thou shalt not eat the blood thereof; thou shalt pour it upon the

ground as water." Deut. 15: 23. They were thus taught this melancholy truth, not only on special occasions, and in the tabernacle and temple worship, but every day, and in their own homes, "Ye shall not drink the blood, for the blood is the life, and ye have no life in you." He that drank of the blood, claimed ceremonially to possess immortality—an offence which was to be visited with the highest severity: "I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people."

In support of this second reason, which I have assigned as the ground of the command to abstain from the use of blood, I may refer you to the declaration of our Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." John 6: 53, 55. Now, this language must have sounded very strange in the ears of a people who were familiar with the prohibition to use blood for food, and the heavy penalty with which it was enforced. The contrast is strikingly apparent between the teaching of Moses and that of Christ; and the inference is irresistible, that in this figurative language of drinking his blood, our Lord referred to the Mosaic prohibition, and suggested to his hearers, that while in themselves they had no life, ceremonially signified by abstaining from the use of blood, they might have life in him, which was signified by the command figuratively to drink his blood. And in the affecting monument which Christ has given to his church, I refer to the institution of the Supper—what is the *act* of every Christian worshipper? Is it not the very *opposite* of that of the Jewish worshipper? The Israelite might not take of the blood on pain of being cut off from Israel. The Christian *must* take of the blood of Christ, which he does virtually in his union with Christ through faith, and emblematically when he drinks of the cup—otherwise he has no part with Christ. The blood is the life: in drinking, therefore, emblematically the blood of Christ, the worshipper shows that *life* is not a personal possession—that no man is inherently immortal—that it is a gift, and that it is in Christ alone. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

I could multiply proofs from the Bible in evidence of this cardinal doctrine, which is among the doctrines of the Bible, what the sun is in the solar system, the grand central fact. I will add, however, to what has already been advanced, but one drawn from a scene at Bethany. When our Lord returned to Bethany, four days after the death of Lazarus, the weeping Martha hastened to meet him, and thus addressed him, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died. But I know that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee. Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Martha believed the doctrine of a general resurrection from the dead which was taught by the Pharisees; but she, in common with all others at that time, knew not the Christian doctrine, that the resurrection depended upon Christ, and but for his mediation would have been impossible. When, therefore, she said, with a peevish confidence, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day," Jesus replied, "I am the resurrection and the life;" and in confirmation of his exclusive prerogative to give life, he wrought the memorable miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead.

The doctrine which I have been endeavoring to inculcate in this lecture, and which appears to me to be the plain, unequivocal voice of the Bible, is, that *life*, eternal life, literally understood, is the privilege of *no man* but the believer in Jesus Christ, through whom it is bestowed as the sovereign gift of God. Now, the popular view of the theory of redemption *excludes* this cardinal doctrine of *immortality alone in Christ;* it builds its theory upon a philosophic conceit, erroneously assuming that we have eternal life as a proper attribute of our human nature. The doctrine of this lecture, I hope, is seen to be the teaching of the Bible, the fair and rational exposition of our text, "The *gift* of God is *eternal life through* Jesus Christ our Lord."

He, then, who teaches that man is immortal, independently of Jesus Christ, introduces a distracting element into the system of the Christian religion. It is to render its plain and obvious teachings obscure and inappreciable, except upon a system of interpretation, which affixes to words ideas which they have nowhere else in the writings and commerce of mankind. It is to flatter human pride, by unduly exalting human nature. It is to commingle with the teaching of God the doctrines and commandments of men, and eminently to deprive the Christian redemption of its chief lustre, and Christ himself of his mediatorial dignity as the *Life-Giver*. "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In this point of view the gospel of Christ assumes a more definite, as it does a more solemnly interesting aspect. This exhibition of the "truth as it is in Jesus," throws around the head of the world's Life-Giver a halo of magnificence and glory. It adds a mighty emphasis to our Lord's declaration, "without *me* ye can do nothing." It shows more obviously the need of a Ransomer, and echoes trumpet-tongued the emphatic '*must*' of the new birth—"Ye must be born again"—ye must be engrafted in the *living* vine. The blood which flows in your veins, through the fall, is mortal; ye must drink of the blood of Christ, or ye have *no life* in you. Ye must be re-created, re-born. Ye are created in the image of the earthly, ye must be created in the image of the heavenly. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. *This* is the Bible doctrine *of regeneration:* "If any man be in Christ he is a *new* creature, old things are passed away, behold all things are become new."

Brethren, let the instincts of your nature—that thirsting for life, which a loving Father has excited within you, as a motive to seek it where it may be found; let the earnest expostulations of that Father's voice, "Why will ye *die?*"—let the free invitation of the Author of life himself, "Let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take the *water of life* freely;" let these, and every other consideration urge you to forsake the companionship of the *dead*, (Prov. 21: 16,) and associate yourselves with the *living*. God forbid that the Redeemer should ever have occasion to say to any here, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Brethren, come, and "when Christ who is our Life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 4.

LECTURE III.—THE FUTURE RETRIBUTION.

"For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."—ISA. LVII. 16.

The design of these lectures is professedly, but humbly, to indicate what I believe to be fundamental errors in the popular religious belief concerning certain portions of the Christian revelation, I shall therefore confine my attention in this lecture exclusively to one branch of the doctrine of future retri-

bution. The Bible gives definite and unmistakeable answers to the anxious inquiries of the believer in Jesus Christ, and assures him that "verily there is a reward for the righteous;" and although "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," yet, says the Apostle, "when he shall appear we shall be *like* him;" and therefore, in joyful anticipation of this distinguished honor, each may declare with the Psalmist, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy *likeness.*"

In entering upon the important and painfully interesting inquiry, relative to the future retribution of the wicked, and purposing to lay before you the results of my own inquiries concerning what I believe to be the teaching of the Bible on this subject, and which, in some respects, will differ materially from the popular creed of the professing church, I cannot but feel, as I have felt throughout these discourses, that I occupy a position of the most solemn responsibility—a position which I am justified in taking only after a prayerful and mature deliberation, and with a firm persuasion that it is at the call of sacred duty. I hope also that I attach due importance to the fact, that the opinions which I am about to call in question have been long embraced by many famous for their learning and piety, and whose opportunities and ability, very far beyond my own, qualify them much better to ascertain the real teaching of the Word of God on this subject. But it is not presumption to say, that even the wisest and best of men are no more free than their humbler brethren from the dominion of customary modes of thought and conventional belief. Indeed, in some respects they are more exposed to this species of tyranny, on account of the reverence which sympathy begets for the opinions of kindred intellects; and because they are apt to be diverted by the wide and ever-expanding sphere of their mental operations.

Duty has its claims upon the simple as well as upon the profound—its obligations are not circumscribed, but only modified by talents and learning. I have therefore done what it is every man's duty to do, that is, to inquire "what is truth?"—in a spirit of meekness, and without discourtesy to the labors of great and good men—at the Bible, the only authoritative source of religious instruction. And if, after much anxiety and earnest prayer, I have reached conclusions which appear to me to be more in harmony with the Divine character and glory, and with the complete system of his revealed truth, than those which are popularly received, what remains to me, but either to keep my conclusions to myself, or, in my capacity as a preacher of truth and righteousness, to make them known to others? The former course I could not adopt, as being incompatible with moral honesty and obligation. I can only say, therefore, in explanation of my present course, "I have believed, and therefore have I spoken."

Sir James Stephen, in the epilogue to his "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," has some remarks which so suitably express the purport of the present lecture, that I cannot do better than introduce here the paragraph in which they occur. "Nothing," he observes, "can be more remote from the design with which these pages are written, than to suggest a doubt, whether penal retribution in the future state, does really await 'the many who are called,' but who throng 'the broad way which leadeth to destruction.' Neither does the writer of these pages presume to intimate that either the nature or the continuance of that penalty are such as to be fitly contemplated by any soul of man, without the most profound awe and the most lively alarm. To propagate or to entertain such opinions, would be to question the truth of Him who is emphatically himself 'the Truth.' The questions proposed for inquiry, are, whether he, or any one of his inspired apostles, has really affirmed in express words that the retribution shall be endured eternally by those on whom it shall fall?—whether all the words employed by him or by them on the subject, are not satisfied by understanding that the punishment is eternal only, inasmuch as it involves the ultimate destruction or annihilation of those on whom it is to be inflicted?—whether the sense usually ascribed to this part of holy Scripture, is congruous with the spirit of the rest of the revealed will of God?—whether it is not really derived from ecclesiastical traditions rather than from any sound and unbiassed criticism?—and whether our own translators have not been induced by those traditions to enhance the real force of our Saviour's words by a forced and exaggerated version of them?"—*Vol.* 2, *pp.* 496–7.

Before addressing myself more immediately to the questions before us, I must offer some preliminary observations, for the sake of preparing the way, in an inquiry which I feel is encumbered with no small amount of difficulty, arising, not so much from the discussion of the subject itself as from the mental condition of many, who, in an assembly like the present, and upon such a theme, can scarcely be expected to be free from the operation of strong and interested feelings. I can conscientiously say, in the presence of a heart-searching God, and before this congregation, that I have been stimulated to this inquiry by the anxiety to know the truth, believing that error, and especially religious error, cannot be otherwise than pernicious to the best interests of mankind. I have to request, then, as well for your sakes as for mine, that you will grant me your patient and candid attention; and that, in the disposition of seekers after truth, you will, so far as you are enabled, hold your feelings and pre-judgments in complete abeyance. My hope is, that in the exercise of a prayerful and independent spirit, you will calmly contemplate the scriptural evidence which I shall endeavor to bring before you; for it is only in this temper of mind, that this, or indeed any religious question, can be properly approached.

There are those, and some such I may be now addressing, who are absolutely *afraid to think*—whose mental operations, if they may be so dignified, have ever been directed by others rather than by themselves; and who are impatient at being disturbed in their ignoble ease. Their minds are rather passive than active; recipient than energetic; and who dread nothing more than being put into a condition demanding mental activity and self-decision. This puerile dependance and self-diffidence—the fruit oftener of mental indolence than incapacity—is frequently associated with a morbid fear of the truth, which necessarily closes up every avenue by which truth can alone reach the understanding and the heart. I would fain believe, however. that there are few of this class among those I now address, and that I may presume upon a reasonable share of intelligence and moral magnanimity in the majority now present.

There are others, and by no means a small class, who consider it a part of religious obedience, and inseparable from Christian humility, to receive the doctrines of the Bible as they are popularly taught; and would esteem it an act of dishonor done to the Divine Word to adventure an independent inquiry into its meaning. There is a proneness to imagine that, in proportion to the antiquity and universality of an opinion, must be its truthfulness; and to question it, the height of extravagance and presumption. Even when evidence the most palpable is presented against any venerable belief, the prestige which attaches to the ancient faith, if it cannot altogether neutralize

the force of opposing evidence, will often act as a paralysis upon the independent energies of the mind.

But let such remember that they must honor God and his truth when they receive the law at his mouth, and derive thence the articles of their religious faith. The Church at Berea was honorably commended, because, when listening even to an Apostle, they received not his instructions until they had examined them by the written revelation of God. I am sure that I shall speak to the knowledge of many whom I now address, when I affirm that religious creeds are more generally framed from the lips of *human* than the *divine* teacher. How comparatively few read the Bible for doctrinal information? It is the custom to learn the doctrines of Christianity *apart* from the Scriptures; and then to make the inspired oracles quadrate with our pre-conceptions and pre-informations. A persuasion is lamentably current, that to get definite ideas of Bible truth, we must read the expositions of accredited divines, whose learning is needed to simplify and popularize the Word of God. Mankind honor the Sacred Book with the title of the Divine *Revelation;* and yet they tacitly affirm that it is inappreciable and obscure! It is a remnant of Popish influence in the popular mind, is the belief, that God does not speak plainly enough in that Book which he has given for the instruction and solace of the simplest, as well as the most erudite of his children; and in reference to which it has been said, "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." The Bible has been the teacher of the Priesthood; and the Priesthood, too exclusively, the teachers of the mass. Religious opinions have been transmitted from one generation to another, much in the same way as titles and estates, which rarely come down to their possessors intact, and without considerable modifications by their successive owners. They have their additions and abstractions, their worthless appurtenances and valuable alienations; they show evidence of the handling and infirmity of human nature. This fact should make the most rigidly orthodox modest in the maintenance of an *inherited* faith, and be a reason why he should bring his religious belief to the light of God's Book, that he may be assured that his belief is justified by its teaching. If I had not been sanguine that those whom I address in these lectures will search the Scriptures for themselves, and test what I have stated by the Word of God, as the only authoritative teacher in religion, I should have been greatly discouraged in attempting to bring before you these deeply interesting inquiries; but, having confidence in the pious independence of many whom I knew I should number among my auditory, and being under a strong conviction that the matter of these discourses is not a subordinate and dispensable part of Divine truth, but "*the* truth as it is in Jesus," I have only to give you the proof to secure your cordial and reverent acceptation of it.

Very few persons, accustomed to think upon the doctrine of future punishment, I am disposed to believe, have been entirely free from doubt with respect to the accuracy of its popular representation. Infidelity has directed some of its keenest, and I may add, most effective shafts against the doctrine of *unending excruciating torture* as the apportionment of the unregenerate in the future world, which have not failed to awaken considerable sympathy in the minds of those hostile to religious obligations, and to occasion much pain and perplexity to the devout believer. This view of future punishment *comparatively few* intelligently and rationally receive. And even those who accept it, believing it to be taught in that Word, to whose decisions they are accustomed to bow, do not *unhesitatingly* receive it as an article of their belief. There is a *secret, irrepressible suspicion of its truth* in the minds of the majority, especially of earnest and independent thinkers—and this, be it observed, not only among the unbelieving and profane portion of mankind, but among the most eminently pious. While they would not detract from the extreme sinfulness of sin, nor mitigate a single element of its just retribution, yet they are unable to discover any proportion between the guilt of the transgressor and his terrible punishment, as popularly taught. Especially when this doctrine is contemplated in the light of God's revealed character—in the view of that attribute in which Jehovah eminently takes pleasure in presenting himself to his intelligent creatures, the attribute of *love*—there is awakened in the mind of the inquirer such an overwhelming conviction that it is absolutely inharmonious with that presentation, that it tends sorely to disturb the complacency with which he dwells upon the Divine moral administration, and, pained and perplexed, he seeks refuge in the banishment of the subject from his meditations. It is set aside as a painful and insoluble problem, and consigned to a voluntary oblivion; but not without a latent and hopeful belief, that the future will prove the fact otherwise than is popularly supposed. I cannot refrain my conviction that there must be something wrong here, for such painful thoughts of God are not the legitimate products of his revelation. God commands his truth to us—he has implanted within us moral perceptions which shall justify his every act, and compel an approving Amen to all his moral decisions. We feel that the doctrine is widely discrepant with God's character, that it stands out in its own solitary tremendousness, and without any analogy in his historic transactions, or present manifestations; but, on the contrary, at irreconcilable variance with them. We cannot meditate upon the subject in this view without secret pain, and a marring of our conceptions of the ever blessed God. The popular representation is vindictive and sanguinary—its very suggestion, but especially its vivid conception, breaks in upon our holiest and happiest moods, dissipating that "perfect love" which, the Apostle says, "casts out fear, because fear hath torment." Surely, brethren, in this relation of the universal mind to the doctrine, there is supplied a powerful motive to induce us, at least, to investigate the grounds of this belief, and to ask, with reference to it, "What saith the Scripture?"

In harmony with the above statements I rejoice to be able to quote in this second edition, the recently published sentiments of an elegant and judicious writer lately referred to:

"Throughout the Holy Scriptures," writes Sir James Stephen, "a constant appeal is made to those moral sentiments which God has himself implanted in our nature. Our heavenly Father has graciously condescended everywhere to point out to us the sacred harmony between his law as revealed by prophets and evangelists, and his law as written by himself on our hearts; and from that harmony we are taught to draw the best and highest proof of the inspiration of those sacred writings. Deeply conscious with what profound reverence it behooves us to apply that test of truth to any opinion deduced by the church at large from Holy Scripture, we may yet venture to inquire whether it could be successfully applied in the case under consideration? If the words ascribed to our Saviour are not inexorably bound down to the construction they usually receive, by the absolutely inflexible force of the text, and of the context, is it not most reasonable to adopt some other construction to which our own natural sense of justice and equity can respond, as clearly as it responds to all the rest of the inspired canon?

"So inveterate is the corruption of the human heart, that, in the judgment of some, the infliction and announcement of no penalty less than that of eternal misery would be sufficient to turn it aside from present sinfulness. But does the dread of that terrific penalty really stem the headlong current of iniquity? Is it really productive of any corresponding alarm? Does it produce an alarm equal to that which would have been excited by the announcement of a penalty of infinitely less amount but definite and intelligible? Does the world—does the church—do her ministers—do her saints—really believe this part of the lan-

guage of our Redeemer in that sense in which they familiarly interpret it? Is any human mind so constituted as to bear the incumbent weight of so fearful a probability of an evil so utterly beyond the reach of exaggeration? Is the texture of any human body vigorous enough to sustain the throes of so agonizing an anticipation? What means the whole course and system of life which is passing hourly before our eyes, and through which we are ourselves passing? Why have our preachers time to engage in study, to harmonize the periods of their sermons, to give heed to our wretched ecclesiastical disputes, to devote one superfluous instant to food, to repose, or to occupy themselves with any other thing than the proclamation of the horrors of the approaching calamity, and the explanation of the only way of escape from it? Let any honest man fairly propose to himself, and fairly answer the question, whether the unutterable disparity between his actual interest in all the frivolities of life, and his professed belief in an eternity of woe, impending probably over himself, but certainly over the vast majority of the human race, does not convict him of professing to believe more than he actually believes? And if so, is there not some reason to doubt whether he has not erred in attributing to his Saviour a meaning for which after all he cannot find any real place in his own mind, or any vital influence on his own heart."—*The Epilogue, Essays in Eccl. Biog. vol. 2, pp. 494–6.*

Before entering upon the scriptural inquiry, I would briefly advert to the early history and development of the doctrine of future punishment. At a very early period, about the latter half of the second and the beginning of the third century, we find that among other doctrinal debates, was that of the duration of future punishment. This was that period in the history of the church, when the philosophic element began extensively to develop itself in Biblical expositions; and we are not therefore surprised to find that age eminently characterized by a spirit of daring speculation, and a gross departure from the simplicity of the faith. In reference to this age, and the influence of the Platonic school upon the Christian doctrines, Neander thus writes:

"There could not fail to arise, then, out of this school itself, an opposition of views; on the one side were those who held this position in hostility to Christianity; on the other, those to whom it proved a point of transition to Christianity. But then these latter, again, were exposed to a peculiar danger. Their earlier prejudices might react in such a way as to prevent their mode of apprehending and of shaping Christian truth. In this way much foreign matter, drawn from their previous opinions, might unconsciously be conveyed over with them to Christianity."—*Gen. Church History, vol.* 1, p. 47. "The new Platonism could not bring itself to acquiesce, particularly in that humility of knowledge, and that renunciation of self which Christianity required. It could not be induced to sacrifice its philosophical, aristocratic notions, to a religion which would make the higher life a common possession for all mankind. The religious eclecticism of this direction of the spirit could do no otherwise than resist the exclusive and sole supremacy of the religion that suffered no other at its side, but would subject all to itself."—*Ibid.* p. 46.

To this age we are indebted for the doctrine of the *natural immortality of the soul*, which is purely a doctrine of Plato's; and it is not difficult to see how the presumption of human immortality led to the belief, that the Scripture doctrine of eternal punishment would be an eternity of conscious misery in hell. While the Platonizing Christians generally taught this doctrine, there were many who repudiated it, and sought refuge in other theories which would satisfy at once their philosophy and the Bible. Some, among whom was Origen, maintained that the punishment of the wicked was limited, and that a time would come when there should be a general restitution; the wicked, having been punished, would, he believed, be reclaimed and restored to God. In this philosophic notion may be discovered the germ of the Popish dogma of Purgatory. Many since Origen have embraced this opinion of a universal restitution; and even in our own times it has many advocates, which may serve to show how eagerly the mind seizes any alternative rather than the popular theory of *unending torment.*

In his private discussions, Origen maintained that the punishment of the wicked is *not* of eternal but limited duration. Nevertheless, fearing that the doctrine would have an injurious tendency in relaxing the ties of moral obligation, he considered it expedient to teach the people in his public discourses that it *will* be eternal. He says, moreover, what I am sure will shock every reverent and truth-loving mind, that the popular fear of eternal misery is a wholesome delusion, (*apatee,*) and invented by God himself! [*Hag. His. Doc. vol.* 1, *p.* 223.] You will, I am persuaded, agree with me, that if the doctrine of eternal misery in hell is not the scriptural representation of future punishment no considerations of expediency ought to permit the religious teacher to inculcate it upon mankind. If it be not a doctrine of the Bible, it can neither be safe nor profitable to teach men to believe it; nor can it be unsafe to labor to undeceive them, if they have hitherto accepted it as an article of religious faith. No human admixture with divine truth has ever contributed to its just acceptability or influence; but, on the other hand, has seriously retarded, in proportion to its prevalence, the progress of that truth in the world. We cannot err, then, in pointing out what we believe to be strictly human dogmas in the popular religious creed, and in recommending the implicit faith of the church, in the bible, and the bible alone.

From the time of Origen up to the eighth century, the doctrine of future punishment, with respect to its duration, continued to be a disputed point. Why this aspect of the doctrine was the more prominent topic of discussion, is accounted for by the fact, that it was a generally assumed point, that the soul is immortal, and therefore must, so long as the punishment lasted, endure conscious misery. It was this philosophic notion that led to doubt the eternal duration of the punishment, and to adopt the theory of an ultimate restitution, rather than a final and complete destruction. Those who maintained against Origen, that future punishment, in the sense of conscious misery is eternal, were by far the majority. Augustine, Chrysostom, and others, founded their argument for the eternal duration of punishment, chiefly on the use of the word *eternal* in the two antithetic clauses in Matt. 25: 41–46, [*Hag. His. Doc. vol.* 1, *p.* 387,] passages which we shall presently have occasion to examine. And from the time of Augustine down to the present, the belief that eternal misery is the portion of the wicked, has prevailed over the doctrine of a limited duration.

No one can study the development of this religious doctrine, in the history of Christianity, without coming to the conclusion that the dogma of everlasting torment in hell is the legitimate offspring of its parent error, the natural immortality of the soul. Nor can any one be familiar with the history and development of religious doctrines generally, without being strongly impressed with the conviction that it is impossible to ascertain what is, and what is not truth, from any other source than the sacred writings. The dogma of everlasting torment has been transmitted to the church by the Platonizing theologians of the second and third centuries, an era more prolific in religious disputation and error than any other in the history of the church. What was then assumed, *is but assumed still*, that man is inherently and essentially immortal—that he will never die in the sense of ceasing to exist. This being accepted as an established article of faith, it is obvious on what ground the dogma of an everlasting existence in torment as the punishment of the wicked, holds its position in the Christian creed. If the wickedness of man, if unrepented of and unpardoned, is to be punished with conscious misery which will never be remitted, then, by virtue of his inherent immortality, he must be forever miserable.

Now, I have already shown, from a plain and impartial examination of the Scripture account of the constitution and probation of Adam, as the representative of the human race, that immortality was not

the privilege of his being—that, on the contrary, it was the grand chartered blessing to be bestowed as the reward of his obedience. Since, therefore, we share in the constitutional nature of our first parent, in whose *likeness* (Gen. 5: 3) we were created, and inherit, as the result of a covenant made with him, all the consequences of his disobedience, it is as obvious as any doctrine in the Bible, that mankind have not immortality as their inherent nature and that if it be enjoyed by any of our fallen race, it will be by gracious communication, and in connexion with the mediatorial agency of the Lord Jesus Christ. To bring 'life and immortality' to a world that had lost it, we saw in the last lecture, was a chief, although not sole object of the Mediator's mission. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the "last Adam" in his representative capacity, corresponding with the original representative arrangement made with the 'first Adam,' accomplished the complete recovery of what mankind had lost; and hence immortality has become a conditional gift, not a primal possession—"The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Our inquiry therefore is, "What does the Bible teach in reference to the nature and duration of future punishment?" In attempting to lay before you the reply which I believe the Bible gives to this inquiry, I will first examine those passages of Scripture which are thought to uphold the popular theory of everlasting conscious misery; and then collect some of the many passages which strongly disprove the dogma of the popular belief.

It is of great importance that correct ideas should be formed of certain *words* which are employed by the sacred writers, when referring to the doctrine of future punishment. On this part of my subject, my aim will be to present to the least informed in classical and biblical learning, evidence at once definite and appreciable, and I shall therefore studiously avoid, as much as possible, the introduction of any matter, which, however it might subserve my purpose, would not contribute to the information of many of my hearers. My object is to communicate the truth, and therefore I shall labor to be understood.

Considerable emphasis is laid by the unlearned reader of the Bible upon the words *eternal* and *everlasting*. Now, it may sound strange in the ears of some, although the classical hearer will justify the affirmation that these words have not necessarily, as their inherent meaning, the idea of endless duration. Our English words *eternal* and *everlasting* certainly convey this idea; but then it must be borne in mind that these words are but translations, and by no means the strict equivalents of what the sacred writers employed; and our in uiry, therefore, respects the proper meaning of the original words of Scripture. These Greek words, a substantive and adjective, have each a singular and plural number, which circumstance is inexplicable, if their primitive and essential signification be endless duration. We do not say *eternals*, *everlastings;* these words, implying endless duration in the English language. will not admit of a plural number. This grammatical circumstance, then, demands your attentive consideration.

Again, these words are not uniformly translated in our English version, for the obvious reason that if one uniform rendering had been preserved, many passages would have been absolutely unintelligible. Hence they are employed as the context may seem to demand.

The substantive (*aion*) occurs one hundred and twenty-eight times in the Greek Testament, sixty-six times in the singular, and sixty-two times in the plural number. Our translators have rendered it as the context seemed to them to require by the following words:—*ever, never, evermore, ages, course, eternal, world, worlds, world without end.* The adjective (*aionios*) occurs seventy-one times, and is thus rendered in our English version—*ever, world, everlasting, eternal.* From this it will be seen that no distinction is made in our version between the substantive and adjective; nor has any attention been paid to the singular and plural forms of these words. The Greek correspondents of our words *everlasting* and *eternal*, are more indefinite, and admit of greater latitude of interpretation. The idea of "*how long?*" is not contained in the original words independently considered; but is borrowed from, and dependant on, the word or words with which they may happen to be associated.

Now, it will be admitted, that if in any case these words are used where a *limited*, and not an unlimited duration is meant, then no argument for the doctrine of an endless duration in misery can be built upon the fact, that they are employed in reference to the doctrine of future punishment; for if they denote, in one instance, a *limited* period of time, they may, of course, do so in another. Let me not be misunderstood in these remarks. I do not assert that the punishment of the wicked will not be eternal. I believe the Bible most distinctly teaches that future punishment will be of eternal duration. My object is to caution the unlearned hearer against the very prevalent error of supposing that the nature and duration of future punishment can be ascertained from *isolated words and phrases*. These, separately considered, are very uncertain guides to a correct judgment, and very unsafe and insufficient data upon which to build such a theory as is popularly believed. The doctrine of everlasting *misery*, which, by the way, is not a scriptural phrase, as are not many others in current usage, and which will be carefully distinguished from the doctrine of everlasting *punishment*, is entirely supported by detached words and phrases, viewed in connexion with the assumption of man's native immortality, which we have seen in a former lecture is not a doctrine of the Bible, but a speculation of false science. I believe that every candid and competent critic will admit that these words and phrases cannot *alone* prove the doctrine of everlasting misery; and that, if it be a fact that man is not inherently immortal, then his punishment may, for aught these mere words and phrases can prove, issue, literally, in what the Bible calls "the second death." Rev: 20: 14.

While, therefore, many put their chief emphasis upon the passages which relate to future punishment, I would lay the greatest stress upon the already proved fact, that mankind are *not immortal;* and that immortality is the "gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord," to all who believe in him, and hope in his salvation; and would further affirm that every inquiry into this subject, which proceeds upon the assumption that immortality is essentially the constitution of human nature, is extremely unsatisfactory, and, in its conclusions, necessarily unsound. In illustration of the insufficiency of mere terms and phrases to prove the nature and duration of future punishment, allow me to direct your attention to the following Scripture citations:

Gen. 9: 16.—"And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it. that I may remember the *everlasting* (Sept. *aionion*) covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." But how can this covenant be *everlasting* in the strict sense of the word? for the world itself will have an end. and the bow in the clouds can refer only to so long as the world exists.

Gen. 17: 8, 13, 19.—And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting* possession. * * He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an *everlasting* covenant."

The land of Canaan is here called an *everlasting* possession; and the covenant of circumcision an *ever-*

lasting covenant. Yet the land of Canaan has long ceased to be the possession of the Hebrews; and, even if they be permitted to re-occupy it, there must come an end when the world itself shall be destroyed. And with respect to the covenant of circumcision, the New Testament has shown that that is *annulled*.

Numb. 25: 13—"And he shall have it and his seed after him, even the covenant of an *everlasting* (Sept. *aionion*) priesthood." But the priesthood of Aaron has long been *abolished*.

Exodus 40: 15—"And thou shalt anoint them as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office; for their anointing shall *surely* be an *everlasting* (Sept. *eis ton aiona*) priesthood." Now, compare with this passage Heb. 7: 12—"For the priesthood being *changed*, there is made, of necessity, a change also in the law." And also verse 18—"For there is verily a *disannulling* of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness of it." Here is Scripture authority to prove that an *everlasting* priesthood has come to an end; and that an *everlasting* covenant is *disannulled*. There is no passage where future punishment is said to be so emphatically *everlasting*, as is affirmed in the passage just quoted of the Aaronic priesthood. It is there said that "their anointing shall *surely* be an *everlasting* priesthood." Now, how much emphasis would be laid upon this word *surely*, if it had been used in connexion with the everlasting punishment of the wicked? And yet we have Paul's authority for affirming that such an argument would be fallacious. The mountains are called *everlasting*. Hab. 3: 6.

For ever. For ever and ever. The same observations apply to the phrases *for ever, (eis ton aiona,)* and *for ever and ever, (eis ton aiona, kai ton aiona ton aionos ;)* they do not of necessity involve the idea of endless duration. In proof, I select the following passages: Exodus 21: 6—"Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the doorpost; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him *for ever*." Of course the meaning is, to the *end of his life*. Ps. 37: 29—"The righteous shall dwell in the land *for ever*," that is, from generation to generation. Ps. 132: 14—"This is my rest *for ever*," (see also Eccl. 1: 4. John 8: 35. 1 Cor. 8: 13, &c.,) that is, from age to age. Ps. 48: 14—"This God is our God *for ever and ever*," that is from age to age; for, in the sense here intended, Jehovah has long ceased to be the God of the Jews. Ps. 119: 43—"So shall I keep thy law continually *for ever and ever*," that is, as the Psalmist meant, through every period of his life on earth. Ps. 148—"He hath also established them [the heavens] *for ever and ever;*" that is, through many successive ages. That it does not denote eternal duration, compare what Peter says, "the *heavens* and the earth which are now * * are kept in store reserved unto fire;" and again, "the *heavens* shall *pass away* with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." 2 Pet. 3: 7–10.

These quotations will suffice to show how careful we should be in constructing arguments upon mere words and phrases, since we read of covenants and ordinances, and many other things which, in the phraseology of Scripture are termed *everlasting*, &c.; but which *have been*, and *will be yet destroyed*. It is not denied that the word is often properly translated *everlasting*, *eternal*, &c.; all that is affirmed is, that it is not the *mere word* which supplies this idea, but the *subject* with which it is connected. Thus, in its application to the Divine Being, it *necessarily* has the idea of unlimited duration; but then it is the *nature* of the Divine Being, and not the *adjective* so translated, which requires this signification, "the *everlasting* God." Rom. 26: 26, (*aionion.*) "To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ, *for ever;*" (Rom. 16: 27, *eis tous aionas,*) necessarily for eternity, for the reason just stated.

Let it then be distinctly understood that the words eternal, everlasting, for ever, &c., when employed to denote the duration of future punishment cannot, independently regarded, prove that punishment is *even eternal;* the proof of its endless duration must depend upon the other auxiliary evidences.

Although I have said that the words translated eternal, everlasting, &c., do not convey by themselves the idea of endless duration, the extent of duration being qualified by their associations and contexts, at the same time, there are passages in which they occur in connexion with the subject of future punishment, which prove that the words *are* so used. And, therefore, let me not be understood, I repeat, to deny that punishment in the future world will be eternal; the eternity of punishment is as distinctly taught as the eternity of the blessedness of the righteous. In proof of this, we need but to refer to one passage: that, for example, which occurs in Matt. 25: 46, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." *Aionon* is the original in both clauses, and would have been better translated so.

It is sufficiently obvious that the words eternal and everlasting, the same word in the original, must, in these two antithetic clauses, mean the same thing. And, therefore, since the blessedness of the righteous is everlasting, so must be also the punishment of the wicked. What I affirm to be the teaching of the Bible is, not that punishment is *not eternal;* but that punishment is *not eternal torment*. Some persons have so habituated themselves to attach to particular words certain meanings, that they seem totally unable to separate in their minds the arbitrary connexion, however imperatively this separation may, by the most incontestible evidence, be demanded. In this manner the phrase, *everlasting punishment*, in the verse now cited, is by many considered to teach the doctrine of everlasting *torment;* torment and punishment being regarded as synonymous terms. But who, that is not a stereotyped thinker, cannot see that the word *punishment* has not, necessarily, the idea of conscious existence in misery? The word punishment itself defines nothing, but is itself defined by some other word. Punishment signifies the desert of guilt; and as that desert is various, so punishment is various also. Punishment does not necessarily involve the *consciousness* of its object; its effects may extend far beyond the consciousness of the being punished. Thus we speak of the *punishment of death;* and is not death, as a penal infliction, properly so termed? Does the culprit think that because he is about to go out of existence, therefore death is no *punishment?* Certainly not; and therefore the phrase *eternal punishment* is as properly descriptive of a *complete destruction* of the conscious existence, or annihilation, as it would be of a continual existence in misery. To blot a living, life-loving being out of existence, is a terrible punishment; and the fact that life will be *for ever* extinguished, will constitute this punishment eternal.

It may help to elucidate the meaning of this much-disputed phrase to compare it with another in Heb. 6: 2. Here we have the expression *eternal judgment*. The same kind of reasoning which insists upon the continuance of the infliction of *punishment* throughout eternity, will oblige us to admit that the *judgment* will continue throughout eternity also. The one interpretation is as obligatory as the other. It is beyond dispute that the word *eternal* in the expression *eternal judgment*, marks the duration, not of the judgment itself, but of its *decisions*. And equally obvious in its meaning is the expression *eternal punishment*—the punishment itself is not to be *eternally inflicted* upon its wretched subjects, but being once visited upon them in their complete destruction, it will never be revoked—"the wrath of God *abideth* on them." It is a punishment which, in its *effects*, is eternal; and, therefore, it is properly designated "eternal punishment."

The apostle Peter, however, has, *apropos* to this disputed point, so employed the term *punishment*, as to place it beyond dispute that *he* considered a *total destruction* to be fitly so denominated. "The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be *punished* * these," he says, "as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, * * shall *utterly perish* in their own *corruption*." Here the punishment is explained by the terms *destroyed*, *utterly perish*, and *corruption*.

"*Eternal fire*," "*Everlasting fire*," "*Unquenchable fire*," "*The fire that never shall be quenched.*"—Much importance is attached to these expressions in support of the doctrine of *eternal torment* in hell. With respect

to the words *eternal* and *everlasting*, I have only to remind you of what has already been said, together with the scripture proofs, that these words do not necessarily signify an *unending duration*. I will now show, by a few scripture comparisons, which will, perhaps, be a more satisfactory and convincing method than any lengthened expository remarks of my own, that these expressions do not demand the popular interpretations of *eternal torment*.

Matthew records the following language as uttered by our Lord: "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25: 41. This passage is commonly referred to in proof that the *fire* will ever continue to burn. To show the incorrectness of this interpretation, I have only to request you to compare with it the language of the apostle Jude, "As Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*." Jude 7. The *eternal* fire which consumed the cities of the plain has been *long extinguished*.

It is possible that some may object that the apostle uses the phrase *eternal fire*, in this place, not in reference to the burning of the "cities," strictly considered, but of their inhabitants, in the fire of hell. In reply to this objection I would observe that the apostle says of these cities that they 'are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire,' which undeniably proves that he refers to the *historical fact* of their destruction by fire, for only *thus* have they been *set forth for an example* to all other evil doers.

Besides this objection assumes what is altogether unscriptural, and to which in the course of this lecture I shall have occasion to refer, viz: that the place of punishment is already in existence, and that the wicked dead are not really dead, but living in the experience of their actual punishment. I will merely observe in this place that if Sodom and Gomorrha are now, and have ever been, since their fiery destruction, suffering their punishment in an *intermediate* hell, why did our Lord speak of their punishment as yet *future*, when, alluding to any that should refuse to welcome his apostle's message, he said: "Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha, *in the day of judgment*, than for that city?" Matt. 10: 15. The great Teacher evidently taught the future punishment of the wicked *after* and *not before* the judgment.

"But he will burn up the chaff with *unquenchable fire*." Matt. 3: 12. "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*." Mark 9: 43. "And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than, having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*." Mark 9: 45.

In these passages, the expression "unquenchable fire," and "the fire that never shall be quenched," are presented as unquestionable proofs of the perpetuity of the miserable existence of the wicked in hell. Let it be observed, that whatever of *perpetuity* belongs to these expressions, pertains *not*, according to the literal expression, to the *objects* upon which the fire acts, but to the *fire itself*. That the wicked should be compared to *chaff*, which of all materials is the most *rapidly consumed*, is far from countenancing the theory of everlasting endurance in torment. But let us compare these passages with others. For example, in the prophet Jeremiah, "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Jer. 17: 27. And yet the same prophet predicts that Jerusalem shall be rebuilt, "Thus saith the Lord, Behold I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling places, and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof." Jer. 30: 18.

Jehovah commands the prophet Ezekiel, "Son of man, set thy face toward the south * * and say to the forest of the south, Hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord, Behold I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee and every dry tree; the flaming flame *shall not be quenched*, and all faces from the south to the north shall be burned therein. And all flesh shall see that I the Lord have kindled it; it shall *not* be quenched." Ez. 20: 46.

The fulfilment of these menaces upon Jerusalem, its final destruction by the Roman power, will sufficiently explain that the scriptural expressions of 'unquenchable fire,' and 'fire that shall never be quenched,' while they indicate the terrible severity of the Divine displeasure, do *not* denote a fire that shall *never be extinguished*. They determine nothing relative to its *duration;* but only to its *efficiency* as an agent of destruction. Isaiah asks—

"Who among us shall dwell with the *devouring fire?* Who among us shall dwell with *everlasting burnings?*" Isa. 33: 14. The *kind of dwelling* to which the prophet refers, may be seen by casting the eye a verse or two back, (Isa. 33: 11-12,) where the wicked are described as "*chaff*," "*stubble*," "as *thorns cut up* shall they be burnt in the fire." Hence, these materials of rapid combustion are said to *dwell* with "*devouring fire*," not *preserving fire*, and the phrase "everlasting burnings" in the end of the verse is explained by the phrase "devouring fire" in the beginning. With this representation corresponds Paul's description of the Divine vengeance, "Our God is a *consuming fire*." Heb. 12: 29.

Two passages in the book of Revelation are often referred to as being decisive of this question. "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night." Rev. 14. "And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night *for ever and ever*." Rev. 20: 10.

Although it is always assumed by those who maintain that future punishment is eternal torture, that these passages refer to the future punishment of the wicked, it is contended by many that they describe rather a condition of misery prior to the final consummation. If it be replied that the extreme anguish which is threatened in these extracts, is more properly descriptive of torment in the future than the present, it can be shown that it is not more severe than was actually experienced by the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Edom, and therefore may as likely, so far as the imagery of suffering is concerned, refer to the present as to the future. But I pass this by. It is apparent this language borrows its expressions from the awful judgments denounced on Edom or Idumea, and may therefore be properly illustrated by a comparison with the prophecy in Isaiah, "For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompense for the controversy of Zion. And the streams thereof (Idumea) shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste: none shall pass through it for ever and ever" Isa. 34: 8–10.

Now, here is language quite as strong, indeed stronger, than that which occurs in the book of Revelation, and yet it is applied to the land of Idumea, where the fire has long been quenched, and the smoke has ceased to ascend up, except in the figurative sense of a perpetual memorial. This language, let it be observed, according to the illustration now given, is *not* incompatible with a limited duration. The language in the book of Revelation, like that of the He-

brew prophets, is highly poetical and emblematical, and can never be justly pressed into an argument for the eternal duration of torment, as the future recompense of the wicked.

From the above comparison of passages of the New with the Old Testament, it is, I think, beyond debate, that the phrases "unquenchable fire," &c., are hyperbolical expressions, which, if they are interpreted, as they should be, according to the meaning they have in the Old Testament, whence they are quoted, will be found to describe not a condition of endless torment, but very grievous suffering, to be followed by a final annihilation. The fire is fitly termed "unquenchable," because it will utterly destroy by a resistless, inextinguishable energy.

Another phrase demands special consideration, because it is always cited with confidence by the advocates of the popular theory. This phrase occurs in Mark, and is thrice repeated, "Where their worm dieth not." Mark 9: 44, 46, 48. This is an expressive image quoted from the prophet Isaiah; and an examination of the original passage will, I think, convince any candid inquirer that, instead of upholding the dogma of eternal torment, it is at irreconcilable variance with it. This expression is sometimes explained metaphorically, of the conscience which excites an eternal remorse in the bosoms of the wicked. But this is evidently not its meaning. The passage is as follows: "And they shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me; for *their worm shall not die*, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Isa. 66: 24. What the prophet states is simply this, that so numerous shall be these loathsome and putrefying *carcases*, that, hyperbolically speaking, the worms will never make an end of feeding on them, nor the fire of consuming them. A glance at the passage will at once convince that the meaning is *not* that the 'worm' of *living* persons shall not die, but the 'worm' of their 'carcases;' so that what is here intended is the putrefaction of dead bodies, and *not* the exquisite eternal torment of the *living*. Like the 'unquenchable fire,' which will not be extinguished until it has completed its work, the undying worm will do its part in the complete demolition of the wicked. This expression, instead of implying, *excludes* the idea of conscious and everlastingly protracted pain.

Much light may be cast upon the nature and duration of future punishment, by a consideration of the term which, with *one* exception, to which I will presently refer, is always used in the original Scriptures to signify the *place* of future punishment. This term is *Gehenna*, or *Gehennem*, and is derived from two Hebrew words, *Ge*, a valley, and *Hinnom*, the name of a person, at one time its possessor. The valley of Hinnom, situate near Jerusalem, had been the scene of those abominable sacrifices which the Jews had perpetrated, when they burned alive their children to Baal and Moloch. There the disgusting remains of these horrid sacrifices were left to be consumed by fire and worms; and from this place the name was derived which denotes, both in the Hebrew and Greek tongues, the place of future punishment. If analogy had anything to do with this appropriation of the term Gehenna, it is difficult to see how a loathsome valley of decomposing and smouldering human remains which were being gradually consumed, should fitly depict a state of conscious, unending misery, as the punishment of the wicked. If the valley of Hinnom was a type of the Gehenna of the damned, the *unconsciousness* and *gradual consumption* of its *dead carcases*, cannot portray the *consciousness* and *eternity* of *living persons*. Analogy suggests rather that suffering to be followed by the corruption of death is the portion of the guilty in the future righteous retribution.

"It may be said indeed," says Archbishop Whately, "that *supposing* man's soul to be an immaterial being, it cannot be consumed and destroyed by literal material fire or worms. That is true: but no more can it *suffer* from them. We all know that no fire, literally so called, can give us any pain unless it reach our bodies. The 'fire,' therefore, and the 'worm' that are spoken of, must at any rate, it would seem, be something figuratively so called—something, that is, to the soul what worms and fire are to a body. And as the effect of worms or fire is, not to *preserve* the body they prey upon, but to consume, destroy, and put an end to it, it would follow, if the correspondence hold good, that the fire, figuratively so called, which is prepared for the condemned, is something that is really to destroy and put an end to them; and is called *everlasting* or *unquenchable* fire, to denote that they are not to be saved from it, but that their destruction is to be *final*. So in the parable of the tares our Lord describes himself as saying, 'Gather ye first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my garner,' as if to denote that the one is to be (as we know is the practice of the husbandman) carefully *preserved*, and the other completely *put an end to*."—*Revelation of a Future State.*

The only place where Gehenna is not used to describe the place of torment, is in the discourse of our Lord concerning the rich man and Lazarus. Luke 16: 19–31. Here, as in an impregnable position, our opponents entrench themselves, and bid exulting defiance, as if our object were to gain a theological victory, rather than to get at the truth. This is the text, when their teaching is openly challenged, from which to preach a silencing sermon both for foes and friends. Venture to impugne the popular preaching on the doctrine of everlasting torment, and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is either the text or the grand conclusive illustration of every orthodox sermon which professes to repel the assault. From this there can be no appeal, at least such is the orthodox conviction. Now we venture to attack this last retreat itself with no other weapon than 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God;' and we think to be able to show that so far from affording any support to the popular doctrines which are built upon it, it is directly opposed to those doctrines, and virtually denies them. Let me, however, first introduce here a quotation from the admirable volume of Trench on the Parables, for the purpose of explaining the use of the parable in Scripture exposition:

"The parables may not be made first sources of doctrine. Doctrines, otherwise and already grounded, may be illustrated, or indeed further confirmed by them, but it is not allowable to constitute doctrine first by their aid. They may be the outer ornamental fringe, but not the main texture of the proof. For from the literal to the figurative, from the clearer to the more obscure, has been ever recognized as the law of Scripture interpretation. This rule, however, has been often forgotten, and controversialists, looking round for arguments with which to sustain some weak position, one for which they can find no other support in Scripture, often invent for themselves supports in these."

This error of making the parable the first source of doctrine is that into which the popular expounders of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus have fallen. They *assume*, that it is a matter of fact, a real historic occurrence, which our Lord narrates; an assumption which erroneously has its origin in the belief, that it would be inconsistent with the dignity of any teacher of truth, and eminently of the Great Teacher, to illustrate his doctrine by any kind of narrative but that of fact. It should be remembered that the object of a parable is to make plain something else by means of analogy. Whether the parable be in itself true or not, is not the question. If this parable must be a real history, on the ground that the Great Teacher could not consistently *suppose* or *create* a case for the purpose of illustration, then *all* our Lord's parables must, for the same reason, be actual historic occurrences. Let us, on this principle, take the parable of the Marriage of the King's son. It is said that when the king "came in to see the guests, he saw there a man who had not on a wedding garment," and having expostulated with him on his gratuitous insult, he commanded his servants "to bind him hand

and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The punishment of this offender for a mere breach of etiquette, is described in the terms which are employed to express the final suffering of the wicked in the future punishment. Is this parable, then, a *real history?* If so, it must have been in the power of this insulted monarch, whoever he was, to consign a man to *that punishment* which *specially* awaits the impenitent in the future righteous retribution! The probability is, that *not one* of our Lord's parables was an actual occurrence, but merely a supposed case—a higher sort of apologue.

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus has been perverted, not designedly I by any means would insinuate, to teach the doctrines of the separate state of the human soul, and a condition of existence in death—of conscious happiness for the righteous, and conscious suffering for the wicked; and this, be it remarked, on the ground that our Lord was delivering *an actual narrative of fact.* Now, let us attempt the explanation of this parable on the supposition that it is a history and not a supposed case, and it will be obvious what inconsistencies and confusion will necessarily ensue. We are informed, that "the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom;" "the rich man also died, and was buried." Here are three historic personages we are to suppose dwelling as disembodied souls, in a state of conscious existence, immediately after death, and before their resurrection. The souls of Abraham and Lazarus in heavenly bliss, and the soul of the rich man in miserable torment; *not eternal torment*, for nothing is said in this parable about the *duration* of the rich man's torment.

Now, what is the aspect of, and what transpires in, this intermediate state? Here heaven and hell are represented as *visible* to each other—in sufficiently close proximity for the inhabitants of the one to be within hearing of those of the other. "The rich man sees Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame." These are said to be *disembodied souls* conversing. The beggar died, and his soul was carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and his body was buried in the grave. What strange conversation for separate bodiless souls! Abraham's soul has, like his body, a *bosom.* Lazarus has a *finger* that he can dip in water, and the rich man has a parched *tongue*, and is enduring literal torment by the 'flame' of fire! And we have been assured moreover, with respect to the rich man that his *body* was buried in the grave! Besides all this, here are represented the enjoyment and suffering of recompenses *before judgment* has been pronounced—and the judgment day is fixed for *after* the resurrection! How is any *proof* to be derived from this parable of the separate state of the immortal soul? And how, when there are such strange inconsistencies on this interpretation, can there be drawn hence the proof that there is conscious life for the dead *when* they are dead, and *before* their resurrection?

But on the other hand it is replied, the scene which our Lord describes is evidently one *between death and resurrection*—for, in the first place, the word *hell* is in the Greek not Gehenna, which is always used in the Scriptures to signify the place of final future punishment, but Hades, which, with the same uniformity of usage, always denotes in the Scriptures the state or place of the dead. Therefore, as the scene is laid in Hades, there must be a state of conscious life for separate souls immediately after death.

And in the next place, the conversation between Abraham and the rich man occurs while the "five brethren" of the latter are alive on the earth—for he prays that Abraham will send Lazarus to his "father's house, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment."

Now, I readily admit that here we have some apparent countenance of the popular doctrines. But let us not forget the law of parabolic interpretation, that the parables must not be made first sources of doctrine. In searching for the Scriptural evidence for the separate state and immortality of the soul, and an intermediate state of consciousness for the dead, I discover *none*—not even the faintest evidence, from one end of the Bible to the other. The terms and phrases which are employed to express these doctrines by their modern advocates, *are not derived from the Bible*, but, like the doctrines themselves, are of human invention. As therefore these doctrines are nowhere taught, but on the contrary are by implication disavowed in the bible, we ought not to allow this solitary parable to be the authority for *such important and extraordinary teaching.*

Literally and historically interpreted, this parable is incapable of conveying any instruction whatever, and therefore we are of necessity compelled to give up the attempt to treat it as a matter of fact. On this account it was impossible that the dullest of our Lord's auditors should mistake his meaning, and imagine him to teach doctrines which the whole of his ministry disallowed and condemned. It must have been obvious to all those who heard this parable from the lips of Christ, that it was a case supposed or invented according to his usual method of exemplifying his instructions. And no less obvious would its teaching be to us, were we free from the dominion of educational prejudices. Having been taught that the soul of man is capable of a separate state of conscious existence, and that when a man is dead he is not dead, but alive in another state, it is natural enough that we should expound this parable in agreement with these dogmas. And it is only when we are able to divest ourselves of that implicit confidence in the truth of all that we have been taught from childhood, and to come with intelligent and devout inquiry to the source of all religious truth, the bible, that we discover, and are qualified to correct these errors.

Giving up, then, as we are compelled to do, the *historic* character of this parable, and adopting the only other opinion, that it is a case *invented* or *supposed* for the sake of the moral it conveyed, we see at once that every difficulty vanishes, and that the parable utters a solemnly intelligible lesson to all who have ears to hear. Our Lord had been discoursing to his disciples upon the impossibility of loving God supremely, while they coveted the wealth of this world. "No servant can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Certain Pharisees were standing by and heard this discourse, and we are informed that being 'covetous they derided him.' They supposed that as sons of Abraham their salvation could not be endangered by their love of riches and the luxurious ease in which they lived. Now it was to expose the folly and futility of their confidence in Abraham, while they loved supremely and covetously their wealth, that this parable of the rich man and Lazarus was delivered. Moreover, the case of the covetous Pharisees was a desperate one. When men can go so far as to deride the plain, salutary lessons of truth, they have made melancholy progress on the road to death. And when this spirit of derision takes its rise from the deeply-seated covetousness of their hearts, their case is all but hopeless. If

the lessons of truth cannot break the bonds of their sordid slavedom, nothing else will. A voice from the silent tomb, or 'if one went unto them from the dead,' would be equally unavailing. To exemplify these truths by a *supposed* case was the design of this parable. Our Lord imagined the case of a certain wealthy son of Abraham against whom he brought no charge of gross immorality beyond that all-absorbing covetousness which inclined him to fare sumptuously every day, while he neglected the wants of his poorer brother, who was allowed to lie at his gate in suffering indigence, and left to be ministered to by the dogs who came to do, in their best way, those kind offices which were denied by him at whose gate he was laid "full of sores." Both the rich man and the beggar were sons of Abraham, as the dialogue shows; but only the beggar was admitted to the spiritual privileges of the Abrahamic sonship; the rich man was disowned and rejected. To exhibit this rejection of the rich Jew by his father Abraham, our Lord gave a supposed scenic representation of the interview. To do this it was needful that he should give existence and utterance to the silent and unconscious dead. Hence the scene is laid in *Hades*, the state of the dead, not Gehenna, the place of the future punishment. Because the covetous Jew will be tormented in the all-consuming fire, and the suffering beggar be exalted to the joys of Paradise, they are represented respectively realizing their condition. It is as if our Lord had said, Were these three deceased persons, Abraham, the rich man, and Lazarus alive, and now that the events of this probationary life are over, brought into each other's presence, such as I have described would be the character and circumstances of the interview. And could that deceased selfish one but know the fearful recompense which awaits him after his resurrection—could he but utter the warning voice to his five brethren who are following his fatal example on earth—he would speak to them from the grave, or commission some happy Lazarus to go 'unto them from the dead.' Hence the representation of the proximity of the places of the blessed and condemned, and the occurrence of the imagined scene while the five brethren of the rich man are on the earth. The whole scene is a *supposed* one; the grave is peopled with living intelligence, and its still silence only broken by imagined discourse, for the sake of administering a solemn warning to those money-loving and self-righteous Pharisees who derided our Lord. I ask, if this explanation is not the only reasonable one, and if it does not clear up every circumstance connected with this important parable? Let me ask if this explanation is not perfectly consistent with the dignity and mode of teaching of our Lord? Is it not usual with the prophets of the Lord to portray hades, the state or region of the dead, by the imagery of a powerfully fortified city, with its massive gates, which close with irresistible security upon the captive dead? Do they not uniformly speak of them as *knowing nothing*, as *dwelling in darkness*, and awful *silence* in the *land of forgetfulness*? Occasionally, like our Lord in this parable, they personify the dead, and give them both action and speech, as in that sublime figure in which Isaiah raises up from their thrones in Hades all the deceased kings of the nations, to taunt the tyrant of Babylon with his own mortality and weakness. The Jews were familiar with such personifications of death—examples of which are furnished in all languages—and therefore to insist, in spite of all the unconquerable difficulties upon expounding this figure of the rich man and Lazarus as an historic fact, exhibits a pitiable tenacity of a favorite prejudice and a mischievous determination, like the Jews of old, to keep their traditions contrary to the voice both of candor and the Scriptures.

It is too commonly taken for granted that the *place* and *elements of torment are actually in existence*; and that the wicked, the moment of their decease, are transferred thither. Now, there are *two* serious objections to this belief; one is, that, on this supposition, only *a part* of the man—his spirit, can be supposed to be in torment, because his body is in the grave. But on this hypothesis, the *man*, who ought to be the subject of punishment, cannot possibly be so, because, until the body and soul are re-united, the *man*, properly speaking, does not exist. Even admitting the possibility of his being so punished, which may be doubted, he is being only partially tormented until the resurrection and resumption of his body. Again, this belief is at variance with the teaching of Scripture, which declares that the judgment *precedes* the punishment; but, according to this opinion, punishment precedes the judgment. All these inconsistencies and errors are the reasonable consequence of departing from the teaching of the Bible, and listening to "science falsely so called," instead of to the voice of Scripture. If the Bible be read carefully on this subject, it will be found that hell, the place of punishment of the wicked, does not yet exist. Satan and his companion apostates, although they may be enduring a hell of some sort, are not in the hell which they are to endure in common with wicked men. He is denominated "the prince of the power of the air," and he "goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." The Apostle Peter distinctly informs us that the destruction of our earth by fire, will accomplish at the same time the destruction of the wicked. "The heavens and the earth which are now," he says, "by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3: 7. This Scripture authority will confirm our view of the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus—that our Lord did not refer to an actual history, but invented the story in the manner of the parable, for the sake of the instruction which he designed to impart. We must turn, then, to other sources of information on this important subject, than to the mere words and similes which are employed in Scripture; although these, when interpreted according to their plain meaning, give a most emphatic contradiction to the popular theory. Having engaged your attention with the principal phrases and passages of scripture, upon which the arguments for eternal torment are constructed, and which I hope you clearly see, are, to say the least, very doubtful foundations of a doctrine so fearfully awful, and which clashes so painfully with our perceptions of the divine character and government, let me now place before you some of the many passages which might be cited, to prove that the punishment of the wicked will issue in their final extinction of being.

That the force of these passages may not be neutralized, I must request you to recall to your memory what has already been proved in the preceding lectures, viz: that immortality is not the personal possession of man; but is a *gift* to him under certain conditions, through our Lord Jesus Christ. If, then, the wicked shall endure, as their appropriate punishment hereafter, an unending existence in misery, immortality, or endless life, will be conferred upon them, as well as upon the believer in Christ; but the Scriptures teach us that immortality is the peculiar privilege of the *regenerate!* To be fitted for everlasting misery, they must be *constituted*, previous to their banishment into miserable exile, immortal beings, otherwise as mortal beings they are constitutionally unfitted to bear the terrible punishment which it is assumed will be their award. But is not this a very awful and dangerous representation of the moral administration of God? Such an exhibition of the final award of punishment contradicts one of our most common perceptions of strict justice; it disregards what is essential to a righteous administration—that there should be a *proportion* between the penalty and the crime. If men sin as mortals, justice requires that, as *mortals*, they shall be punished. It is inconceivable that the divine Being, whose acts are ever in accordance with the strictest equity, should award a punishment infinitely beyond the native capability of endurance, and to fit the guilty being for its terrible infliction, should re-create him, and cast a new and alarming element—the element of immortality—into his constitution. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Had he not revealed the righteous principles, upon which his decisions will be based, when he assures us that every one shall be judged and recompensed according to his deeds, opportunities and circumstances? The popular theory eternal torment involves this injustice or the absurdity of a finite being becoming capable of an infinite burden of suffering.

Let the following Scripture statements prove whether the bible doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked does not more obviously agree with the bible doctrine of the native mortality of man than the philosophic conceit of human immortality. If we had formed no opinion upon the nature and duration of future punishment, but had ascertained that the Bible taught the mortality and perishableness of our fallen nature, we should expect to find such descriptions given as would obviously accord with this previous instruction. I submit, then, the following, out of many passages which might be selected for your consideration.

The terms "consume," "destroy," "destruction," and "corruption," used to denote the nature of future punishment.

"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away." Ps. 37: 20. "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more." Ps. 104: 35. "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness

of his coming." 2 Thess. 2: 8, (*anatosei katargesei.*) "For when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them * and they shall not escape." 1 Thess. 5: 3, (*olethros.*) "But these as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things which they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Pet. 2: 12. (*Pithoran.*) "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1: 9. (*Olethron aionion.*) "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul:" not, as some suppose, because it is immortal and indestructible, as is shown by the latter part of the text, "but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10: 28, (*apolesei*, from *apollumi*, to bring to nought, to render void.) "The Lord preserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked will he destroy." Ps. 145: 20.

The employment of the terms "perish," devour." "perdition," to describe the nature of future punishment. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." John 3: 15, (*apoleetai.*) "And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." John 10: 28, (*apolontai.*) "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish." Acts 13: 41, (*aphanistheete*, literally, vanish. See also Rom. 2: 12; 1 Cor. 1: 18. 2 Cor. 2: 15: 2 Thess. 2: 10; 2 Pet. 2: 12.) "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." Heb. 10: 26, 27, (*esthien.*) "In nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God." Phil. 1: 28, (*apoleias.*) "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul," (life.) Heb. 10: 39. See also 1 Tim. 6: 7; 2 Pet. 3: 7, (*apolcian.*)

The employment of the term "death," as descriptive of the nature of future punishment. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death." John 8: 51–52, (*thanatos.*) "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Rom. 8: 2, 6. "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 21–23. "Who (the Gentiles) knowing the judgment of God, that they which do such things are worthy of death." Rom. 1: 32. "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." Rev. 21: 8. "And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Rev. 20: 14, (*thanatos o deuteros thanatos.*)

Ponder attentively this last extract from the book of Revelation: "This is the second death." Here an analogy is drawn between the death of the future punishment, and the death which men endure in this life. Look, brethren, in imagination upon the corpse of the dead, and say whether that suggests consciousness and sensation, as being the everlasting portion of the wicked hereafter. It is also said that death and hades shall be cast into the lake of fire. Death and hades are mere abstractions, mere personifications, and not personalities; are death and hades, then, to be associated with the wicked in the endurance of everlasting torment? Is not this imagery a most emphatic picture of what the "great voice out of heaven" said, "There shall be *no more* death?" Rev. 21: 4. Death and hades are to be cast into the lake of fire, to be, as it were, destroyed, together with the wicked.

I am aware that attempts are made to obviate this conclusion, by affirming that all these terms are but figures of speech, and that they have a spiritual meaning. On the figurative interpretation of these and other similar words, I have already remarked in a former lecture, (II.) in which I think it was clearly shown that the system of figurative interpretation was neither required nor justified, and that it did but obscure the plain meaning of the Word of God. If the conclusions at which we arrived in the former lectures be correct, as I cannot but believe every impartial student of God's Word will allow, viz: that Adam failed to secure in Eden for himself and his posterity the conditional privilege of immortality, and that immortality is brought by Christ, and is the gift of the Father through him to believers only—then there is a positive necessity that the words *destruction*, *perishing*, *consuming*, *devouring*, *perdition*, and *death*, to which might be added some very expressive similes, should be *literally* understood as descriptive of the future punishment of the wicked, unless the other and only alternative be accepted, that God will immortalize the wicked that they may be capable of enduring their everlasting torture. But such a supposition is most impious in its aspect towards the righteous God, and most unjust towards the wicked; and, therefore, the conclusion is unavoidable, that they will ultimately be blotted out of existence. "They shall perish with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." "This is the second death."

Look at the popular doctrine of unending torment, in the view of the passage which stands at the head of this lecture. The Creator himself declares that the human soul could not sustain his everlasting wrath, that it would fail or perish under the pressure of such protracted indignation. I leave it, then, with the advocates of the popular theory to say, if they will charge God with the dreadful intention of supernaturally strengthening the wicked for the endurance of punishment. They are on the horns of no common dilemma, from which an abandonment of their theory can alone extricate them. Let them compare their theory of eternal torment with my text, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

On the nature and details of the future punishment of the wicked there is considerable diversity of opinion even among those professing Christians who arrogate to themselves the claim of being the orthodox or evangelical church. One will understand the term "fire" in its literal sense, and believe that this is to be the material agent of the endless torment of the wicked. Another will discard this conception of the literal element of *fire* as gross and plebeian, and affirm that the agencies of torment are not material, but moral; obviously proving that the prevailing notions of the future punishment differ considerably, are rather general than specific, vague than well defined, and originating less in scriptural than conjectural causes.

The language of the apostle Peter previously quoted, is so explicit that none but such as prejudge this question can possibly mistake its instruction. "The heavens and the earth which are now by the same word are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3: 7.

In this passage are the following plain revelations. First, the earth is to be destroyed by fire. Lower down in the same chapter he says: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." And again, "All these things shall be dissolved." "The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved." Here is no room for any diversity of opinion with regard to the meaning of the word "fire." Let it then be observed in the next place, that Peter assures us that the burning of the world is to be the time and means of the future punishment. The "heavens" or super-jacent atmosphere, with the "earth," are to be destroyed by fire, but their destruction is "reserved" until after the decisions of "the day of judgment." and for the purpose of effecting "the perdition of ungodly men."

The instruction of this passage is beyond misapprehension, and the following are its undeniable revelations.

1. The agent of the future punishment is literal fire.
2. The fire of hell is not yet kindled, and will not be until after the wicked are raised from the dead, and the processes of the great judgment are completed.
3. The future punishment will not be an endless preservation in misery, but a total destruction or annihilation.

On the authority of this one passage alone we are justified in pronouncing the modern notions about the nature, time and duration of the future punishment as altogether false and mischievous. Taken in connection with what precedes, it must surely convince every impartial student of God's Word, that the popular teaching on this painfully interesting subject is anti-scriptural and adverse to the integrity and efficiency of scriptural Christianity. We are not therefore to understand by the fire of hell, the chastisement of a condemning conscience, since the fire which consumes the world will be the instrument of the future punishment. Neither are we to believe that immediately after death and before the resurrection is there any place or consciousness of punishment for the wicked, since the burning of the world at the last day is to kindle the "lake of fire" to consummate "the perdition of ungodly men." Nor are we to represent this burning of the wicked to be everlasting, since they will be in the midst of the burning world, and will share its fate, which is to "pass away," to be "dissolved," and "burnt up." "For behold the day cometh," says the prophet Malachi, "that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. And ye shall tread down the wicked, and they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Ch. 4: 1–3.

I cannot feel the weight of the objection which some have brought against this exposition of the doctrine of future punishment, that it is a license to the wicked to continue in sin. Who, I ask, are they that secretly felicitate themselves in the hope of a final annihilation? Are they not those who now, even in the very teeth of the threatening of the popular creed, will, with terrible effrontery and hardihood, sin on, despite the everlasting wailings which they are taught they must endure? Say not that I give the reins to impiety because I proclaim a cessation to the "weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." In the plastic hand of the wicked, there is scarcely any doctrine that may not be most mischievously perverted. Were there not some in Paul's time, who, because he had taught that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound," said in their hearts, "let us sin then for the abundance of grace?" with whom he was obliged to expostulate, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid." Rom. 6: 1. Therefore the doctrine of this lecture must be discarded, for other reasons than because some awfully wicked spirits, who have made up their minds to sin that sin which is unto death—to blaspheme the Holy Ghost and die—pervert it to their own abandoned ends, thus exhibiting themselves as "vessels of wrath *fitted* to destruction."

My answer then, to this objection is furnished in the inquiry, "What is truth?" Is the punishment of the wicked to be *eternal torment* or *eternal destruction?* "What saith the Scripture?" If it replies, "The wages of sin is death"—utter destruction—then my way is clear; my mission is, to tell the truth, and to leave consequences with God. If the Bible teaches that the wicked will

be eventually blotted out of existence, then he who believes this to be the truth, and, like Origen, from motives of dishonest expediency, preaches that mankind will be punished with everlasting misery, tells a terrible and most mischievous lie in the name of the Lord, and exemplifies the very spirit of priestcraft and spiritual deception. If God has declared that the wicked shall perish—be plucked up root and branch, burnt up, consumed, devoured, destroyed, fade away, be no more, die, that they shall utterly perish in their own corruption, and endure the second death—can it be obedience to God, and profitable for mankind, to say, that all this is figurative language—and that the wicked shall *never die*? Is it not to enact the great rebel, and to say as he did, in the very face of the Divine testimony, "*Ye shall not surely die!*"

Now those persons who consider it a most dangerous thing to deny the doctrine of eternal torment, and who are weak enough to believe that he who ventures to do so must be on the high road to infidelity, are generally those who have been induced to believe it, not because they discovered it in the Bible, but because they have been so taught. The extreme displeasure with which they denounce the imagined innovation, leads one to ask if they have any interest in upholding the popular doctrine. It surely does not minister to their sympathetic case, to believe that hereafter a mighty multitude which no man can number shall live on in racking agonies throughout a lingering eternity! It is marvellous that human *hearts* should repel a doctrine which their *heads*, when soundest, are most ready to receive. This is unreasonable and unnatural. But I cannot believe that it is either the head or the heart that acts thus unadvisedly; it is a morbid timidity lest truth should not take care of itself, and error, despite its omnipotence, should spread havoc and desolation around.

But, brethren, I have greater reason for being shocked at your upholding the doctrine of eternal torment, than you have for being shocked at me in denying it. Do you really believe that when an unregenerate human being dies, he is plunged into the terrible gulf of everlasting torment? How, then, can you mingle with your ungodly neighbors and friends without constantly urging them, "in season and out of season," to flee from *such* wrath to come! How is it that you have not so warned every one that you came in contact with this day, despite the conventionalities of modern society? Your stupendous faith would justify any manifestation of intrusive solicitude. How, believing this doctrine, can you calmly suffer days and months and years to be consumed in the varied concerns of this transient life, and not, Jonah-like, daily lift up your warning voice in the city of your habitation? And how can you lay your head upon your pillow at night, and compose yourself to sleep, knowing that hundreds and thousands, in every part of the world, before you awake on the morrow, will have tasted the first bitter draught of the exhaustless cup, and have felt the first terrible pang of "the worm that never dies," and "the fire that shall never be quenched!" How, I ask, can you give "sleep to your eyes and slumber to your eyelids," when, perhaps, the partner of your life, or your beloved children, or some other dear relative, may all the while be exposed to the unending torments of hell? Tell me not that you believe your doctrine—your indifference is terribly criminal if you do: the blood of humanity cries bitterly against you! Your zeal for the dogma of eternal torments, while you are thus neglecting to warn dying men, is your heaviest and most severe rebuke. I prefer the doctrine of my text, which, while it does not deny the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked, nor make the salvation of man less an object of interest and solicitude, yet gives a most *emphatic denial* to the doctrine of eternal torment. "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

This subject is not to be treated as a mere matter of opinion, which we may hold or reject as we thiuk proper. If it be a part of God's revealed truth that the wicked will ultimately be destroyed, then it is utterly impossible to deny this truth without introducing considerable mischief into the evangelic system. We have only to examine the effect of the popular doctrine upon the faith of the church, to be convinced that its influence is pernicious. The Apostles preached in such a way, that they excited in their hearers a love for, and aspiration after, heaven; and their own inner life was manifestly the experience of joyful and ardent anticipation of the glory awaiting the righteous. The natural tendency of their preaching was to stimulate the energies, exhilerate and elevate the heart, and develop and mature sanctified character. But this is not the tendency of most modern preaching, especially where it is the habit of the preacher to dwell much upon the doctrine which I have ventured to repudiate. Instead of rejoicing the heart of believers, in giving them an all-engrossing expectation of their Lord's second coming—instead of awakening in their hearts an earnest response to the Amen! of the Apocalyptist, when he said, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"—it impresses upon the church too effectively the painful conviction that this longed for revelation of Christ will be a revelation of wrath. The terrible nature of the popular doctrine of future punishment almost annihilates the prospective pleasure which the church should enjoy. Heaven is, to a lamentable extent, anticipated as a *refuge from hell*, rather than *longed for* for its hallowed and blissful engagements. Can we wonder that the effect of such views and feelings should be to check the growth of a healthy and happy piety, since it destroys the operation of that perfect love which eminently characterized the ancient saints? *Fear* has supplanted the place of *love* in the bosoms of the mass, and until love is restored to its rightful pre-eminence in their sanctified consciousness, in vain shall we expect to see, as the general experience of the Church, an earnest, self-denying, rejoicing piety. Paul says, "Rejoice in the Lord always;" but the heart of the Church is heavy and depressed—fear has cast out that "perfect love," without which it is vain to exhort, and unreasonable to expect. Look, brethren, around you, and see how few are rejoicing believers. Where there is one who knows what the "peace of God" is "which passeth all understanding," there are twenty whose inner life is one uniform state of dissatisfaction and uneasiness. Their spirit is that of the slave, which scarcely dares look up to heaven, and still seldomer yearns to be admitted there. The "new earth wherein dwelleth righteousnets" is less frequently a first than a second thought: "the bottomless pit" is the gloomy suggestion of the brighter and better world.

In this respect, the development of Christian character in our times exhibits a remarkable contrast with the earlier development which the New Testament exhibits; and I am led to believe that this fact is to be accounted for in intimate connection with the question before us. It deserves our attention that the recorded sermons of the Apostles, and also their writings, are comparatively deficient of allusions to the subject of future punishment at all; and, what is more astonishing, there is a marked abruptness in the utterance of their emotions whenever they have occasion to refer to the subject. Now, if the Apostles believed that the punishment of the wicked will be everlasting torment, how shall we explain these phenomena? It surely deserved a very considerable prominence in apostolical preaching, if as is popularly believed, to save us from eternal torment was the moving cause of the Mediator's mission, and the grandest evidence of God's ineffable love. No vivid and pathetic descriptions of the punishment of the wicked are, however, to be met with in their writings: they never attempt to portray the dreadful picture of future wrath—make use of no language indicative of the vision of terrible images of deathless agonies, but briefly advert to it occasionally, and then in terms which, if accepted according to their conventional meaning in common usage, would lead to the belief that the Apostles expected a "second death," or complete extinction, to be the portion of the wicked.

It is sufficient to mention, that the style of much modern preaching is the very reverse of that exhibited in the writings and discourses of the apostles. Genius itself, to find imagery and language merely, is put to the torture. Imagination stretches itself to the utmost, to depict the horrors of the condemned, and the most painful emotions evidently agitate the mind of the earnest preacher of the popular theory. He believes it, and it is natural, therefore, that he should often refer to it, and make it the ground of his most faithful appeals. No one will imagine that the apostles were not men of strong feelings and lively sensibilities, nor attempt to account for this extraordinary fact by asserting that their writings were less emotional than ratiocinative and preceptive. Paul, whose writings constitute the chief portion of the epistolary New Testament, exhibits sometimes the intensest emotion. I need only remind you of his ecstacy over the vanquished death and the grave, (1 Cor. 15: 55,) and of his memorable declaration, however you interpret it, concerning his brethren after the flesh. Rom. 9: 3. To mention but one occasion which occurs to me, when we should have expected that Paul, had he believed the popular theory, would have addressed his brethren in language, not only earnest but descriptive, I refer to his recorded address to them at Antioch, in Pisidia; but we hear him, under most painfully affecting circumstances, thus curtly addressing them: "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets: Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*. * * It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Acts 13: 40, 41, 46.

This absence of any attempt at *vivid and pathetic portraiture* of the miserable condition of the wicked hereafter, adds considerable weight to the evidence for the literal interpretation of their language on this subject, and justifies us in believing that Paul and the New Testament writers generally believed the future punishment of the wicked to be their utter annihilation.

A difficulty may be suggested to the contemplative mind by the statement that the wicked will share a common fate—that all will in the end perish. The Scriptures most certainly make a distinction in the wretched experience of the wicked hereafter. We are assured that it will be "more tolerable" for some than for others—that there will be those who "shall receive the *greater* damnation." But we have no decided information concerning what will precede—what will be the *beginning* of the *end*. The interval between the resurrection of the wicked and their "second death" will, we cannot doubt, be sufficiently long to afford an opportunity for the manifestation of the discriminative justice of God, "who will render to every man according to his work," inflicting upon some "many" and upon others "few stripes." The wicked will obviously share a common end; "the candle of the wicked shall be put out;" but previous to that end their conscious experience will be as various as their characters and deserts.

I would only observe, finally, for the sake of the anxious fears of any present, that it is a mistaken notion that the public proclamation of this doctrine is injurious in its tendency. The question is—Is it true? for if it be true, then it cannot be injurious. Whether we view this doctrine in relation to the well-

being of society, or the personal salvation of mankind, in neither aspect is there any ground for apprehension. For, before it can be declared injurious to social morals, it must be shown that the vices of the community are really kept within the present limits through the belief in the doctrine of everlasting torments, as the future punishment of the wicked. How far this belief operates beneficially in this respect it is impossible to say, but there is reason to apprehend that its influence is exceedingly small in this direction. The fear that the denial of this view of the future punishment will affect most disastrously the condition of society, implies the assumption that the doctrine in question is the *principal conservative of the social morals*, and the powerful restraint upon those baser passions, which only need its removal to break forth in frightful inundation of all social order and safety. This is surely to exaggerate the practical value of this doctrine. Is it not rather the dread of that certain and nearer retribution which the criminal laws of the country threaten, that hold in check the mischievous excesses of evil-disposed men? And besides this conventional restraint, is there not another and potent one, which lies in the constitution of our nature, which compels the confinement of evil passions within certain limits, on pain of a summary and terrible penalty. These two sets of laws—*the laws of the country, and the laws of the human constitution*—are unquestionably the chief safeguards of social order. There is, alas! too much scepticism and awful recklessness of all future consequences among the delinquents even of a nominally Christian country, to permit the belief, that the more elevated motives of the Word of God have a chief influence upon their characters and conduct. They are too much the creatures of time and sense, to be influenced to any great extent by the sanctions of eternity.

And with regard to the influence of the disbelief of this doctrine on the personal salvation of mankind, it is to altogether misapprehend the nature of that salvation, and the motives that urge to its acceptance and enjoyment; if it be supposed that this awful exhibition of the future punishment, or even that punishment at all, however firmly believed, accomplishes the salvation of men. "The devils believe and tremble:" but in order to be saved, the eye and thought, too, must be averted from the bottomless pit to the Cross, and to Him who, crucified thereon, so displays the quality and extent of the divine love for men. Not one that will be among the saved at the great future gathering of the church, will have been saved by the fear of hell torments, whether temporal or eternal; nor even by the dread of punishment of any kind whatsoever. Their salvation will be owed to a *drawing*, not a *driving* power; the drawing of divine love, through the character and mission of Jesus Christ. Let it never be forgotten, that *terror* is not the power which brings mankind to Christ, but *love;* this, and this only, is the efficient power which melts by its fervor the iron obstinacy of the hardest heart.

But some have flattered themselves that they can sin on, and take their full draught of iniquity, if they are not to endure eternal torment. What impious madness is this! Such, surely, will have the greater damnation! The punishment which awaits such will be long, awful, and dishonorable enough to be worthy the name of *vengeance*. "Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord." Its first approach will be sufficient to excite the predicted invocation, "Ye mountains, fall on us—Ye hills, cover us." The ingredients in that blood-red cup will be potent enough to stir up the most pungent remorse. The fire will be keen enough to stimulate the "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth;" and the whole scene horrible enough to be worthy the name of *damnation!* That any can callously contemplate the awful representation of the future wrath contained in the Scriptures, seems scarcely credible. The declaration of the Apostle Peter, that "the heavens and earth, which are now, are kept in store, *reserved unto fire*, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," is suggestive of a punishment, from which our sensitive natures shrink with instinctive horror. And this is but the terrible sequel, the closing scene of the great mortal tragedy. Before punishment is the judgment, and although we know nothing of the processes of the great final assize, nor what shall be its duration and precise moral effects upon the wretched consciousness of the condemned, yet it is probable that its conduct will be such as to afford ample opportunity for conscience to collect her chastising forces, for the infliction of the "many" or the "few stripes," as the case may be. Who can conceive that scene of mortal sorrow, when remorse, fed by a then too faithful memory, is lacerating every human bosom, and every cry for mercy is met by the reply, "I know you not, depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity?" With what awful suspense will the wretched victims of self-delusion and guilt await the kindling of the destroying element, whose flowing flames shall engirt the earth in one vast fiery deluge!

The horrible sounds of the dissolving heavens which are to "pass away with a great noise," will be heard in dreaded anticipation; "the elements" that "shall melt with fervent heat," will have already breathed around their scorching atmosphere—and "the earth," whose scenes, originally of beauty and innocence, have become associated with, and suggestive of, suffering and sin, will, even then, in fearful imagination, be wrestling with "the fire that shall not be quenched," until its triumphant flames have accomplished their devastating mission, and 'the works that are therein shall be burnt up!' Oh horrible ruin! And to be involved therein! Living, life-loving, sensitive human beings, waiting to be 'burnt up' in the fires of the burning world! Is this no punishment—a license to sin on—a justification of guilty complacency? Is this not hell—the fit antitype of Gehenna? Must it, to be complete, be inextinguishable, so that this earth, having become a perpetual hell, shall travel on in its wonted orbit, freighted with burning but unconsumed humanity? Must corruption be eternized to glut the sanguinary maw of undying worms—and the fire everlastingly wreathe around the vitals of essential life, otherwise the exigencies of Scripture language are unmet? May mankind be fearless, if they fear not this? Is it not written, "Rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell?" Will the guilty refuse to 'fear' on any assurance less than that God will perpetuate 'both soul and body in hell?' Because the miserable sufferers will in the end perish, will any despise the future hell? If so, we can but respond to such desperate impiety, in the words of Paul, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish!"

Is it so that any man can secretly congratulate himself, that hell-torments are not *eternal;* and not only refuse to fear, but, on this ground, can also justify and rejoice in his rejection of Christ? Wretched man, how little dost thou know of Christ! Let all such remember, that they are incompetent judges *now* of what will be their feelings *hereafter*. The bible assures us that it will be a terrible calamity to the wicked; its phrases and figures by the interpretation of this lecture are not deprived of their awful significancy. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Let such, while consciousness is theirs, conceive of themselves slumbering in awful silence after the first resurrection of the believers in Christ awaiting that resurrection which shall call up the shrouded wicked from the sleep of the grave! Is there nothing terrible in this anticipation! Will there be nothing terrible when, gathered together on the doomed world, which, in its final conflagration, is to consummate the *perdition* of ungodly men, they shall see heaven opened, the great white throne erected and occupied, and the multitude of the redeemed the children of the "first resurrection"—returning with the host of heaven to grace the triumph of their Lord, and be spectators of the degradation and destruction of his enemies—themselves those enemies, and the objects of that perdition? Will there be no *desire* for the blessedness of the righteous, when they see their incipient enjoyment and honor? Will there be no wailings, no compunction, no entreaty for pardon and grace *then?* Will it *then* be a bright spot in the dark perspective of the miserable future, that their torments will have an *end!* Will *life* then be a despised thing?—to lose its honors and blessedness, of little moment? Alas, no! *Desire* will be as *strong* as lamentation. *"The wicked shall see, and be grieved; he shall gnash with his teeth, and melt away; the desire of the wicked shall perish."* Ps. 112: 10. 'This is the *second death.*' Into the all-devouring lake will Satan also be cast, and every agent of evil in the universe; and, when destruction has done its work, and its tumult is hushed in silence—then shall the stillness be broken by the anthems of the redeemed; every blot in the creation will be effaced; 'the former things are passed away,' and "*God shall be all* IN ALL."

The time shall come when every evil thing
From being and remembrance both shall die;
The world one solid temple of pure good.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

VOL. VII. NEW YORK, OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER, 1852. NOS. 10 and 11.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

METHODIST QUARTERLY.

"THE INTERMEDIATE STATE AND PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED."—Such is the title of an article in the Methodist Quarterly Review for April last. The writer opens by saying:—

"It has been recently urged with much confidence, and with some show both of argument and of critical learning, that it is the doctrine of the Bible that human beings are entirely unconscious between death and the resurrection; and that the punishment of the wicked will be annihilation."

The writer goes on in an attempt, as a "preliminary," to "prove that the soul has an existence distinct from that of the body, and that it may have a separate existence." His argument on this point is so much like that of Luther Lee, which has been met and abundantly refuted by "Anthropos," in the "Unity of Man," that we let it all pass by, referring our readers to that work.

We next come to his argument "to show that the soul is conscious between death and the resurrection." The discussion shall now take the dialogue form, and METH. will stand for Methodist Quarterly Review; and EXR. for Examiner. METH. will lead and the EXR. will respond.

METH.—"The Bible teaches that the dead, both righteous and wicked, are conscious. This has been the nearly universal belief of Christians from the days of the apostles."—p. 241.

EXR.—Here are two mistakes. The Bible teaches no such doctrine; and we venture to affirm, it was not the belief of Christians till the church was corrupted by the introduction of pagan philosophy sometime *after* all "the apostles" had "fallen asleep."

METH.—"They who oppose this doctrine [the consciousness of the dead] refer to a number of passages, contained, with a single exception, in the Old Testament."—p. 241.

EXR.—Not quite correct. We have the doctrine of no future life without a resurrection clearly taught in *many* texts in the New Testament. The whole apostolic teaching, touching a future life, goes to show that they nowhere held the doctrine you contend for. They never comfort believers with the idea that their deceased friends were now *conscious*, or in heaven, as modern theologians do. A strange defect, truly, had they believed it.

METH.—"The writers of the Old Testament generally speak of death as to its effects on the physical organization, and its results in relation to the concerns and interests of this world. They speak just as we frequently do of death and the grave. We admonish our fellow men to work while the day lasts, because the night cometh, and that in the grave there is no knowledge or work; and so did those writers."—p. 242.

EXR.—Then you speak truth, and speak scripturally.

METH.—"But neither they nor we, in these expressions, assert any thing for or against the unconsciousness of the soul."—p. 242.

EXR.—Is not "knowledge" a "*function* of the soul"? So you maintain, page 240, when you say, "reasoning, conception, volition, &c.," are "among its functions;" and are *not* functions of the body; which you there affirm are "respiration, circulation, motion, &c." If then "knowledge" is a "function of the soul," as you have said; and *you*, in common with the Old Testament writers, "admonish men ** that in the grave" [*sheol*—the state of the dead] "there is no knowledge," as you say you do, is it not fair to conclude that you "assert the unconsciousness of the soul"? I regard your dilemma to be an inextricable one, if you mean what you say of the functions of soul and body.

METH.—"We do not believe, and we suppose that they [the O. T. writers] did not believe, that the soul is buried with the body in the grave."—p. 242.

EXR.—Whether *you* speak what you mean or not is not for me to say: but "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," undoubtedly, did so speak: and they affirm, not of a dead body merely, lodged in a hole in the earth, that *it* has no knowledge, but that in *sheol*, where dead *men* go, "there is *no knowledge*." The Old Testament writers did believe the *soul* went into *shoel*, which is the word translated "*grave*"—Eccl. 9: 10, from which you quote. Thus the Psalmist saith—"Thou wilt not leave *my soul* in *sheol*": Psa. 16: 10. Again—"Thou hast brought up *my soul* from the *grave*"; Psa. 30: 3; that is, he "kept" him "alive" and did not suffer him to die; for if he had died his *soul* would have gone into the same "grave," *viz. sheol*, in which it is affirmed "there is *no knowledge*"; and, of course, the souls which

enter there are "unconscious." Such was the faith of the O T. writers, whatever you may believe or disbelieve.

METH.—"Eccl. 9: 5, 'For the dead know not anything,' is a text, perhaps, quoted more frequently and with more confidence than any other, by those who deny the consciousness of the soul after the death of the body, but they always stop at the end of this clause. The wise man adds, 'neither have they any more a reward.'"—p. 242.

EXR.—We do not always stop where you say: we have frequently, both in writing and preaching, dwelt upon the expression, "neither have they any more a reward," as additional evidence of the unconscious state of the dead; because, if conscious they *have* some sort of reward. The wise man does not affirm they never *will* have a reward. He uses the *present* tense; indicating the state they are *now* in: "neither *have* they any more a reward;" and immediately assigns the reason—"for, the memory of them is forgotten." We understand this last expression to refer to the memory of the dead ones; and the tenth verse confirms this view, for there he reaffirms the doctrine of the fifth verse of the entire destitution of knowledge among the dead ones; and the Psalmist is equally as explicit when he saith—"In death there is *no remembrance* of" God: Psa. 6: 5. Thus our position is doubly fortified, and your attack upon it has only served to make it more apparent that it is invulnerable.

METH.—"The passage in the New Testament referred to above" [as the only one in the N. T. that those who oppose the conscious state of the dead use] "is Acts 2: 34, 'David is not ascended into the heavens.' We do not know that it is necessary to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead, if conscious, have 'ascended into the heavens.' They may exist in a state of consciousness elsewhere, which sufficiently answers the argument from this passage."—p. 243.

EXR—That is cool, *very cool*, truly, Bro. Meth. What then becomes of all the Methodist and "orthodox" fancies of flying off to heaven at death! Truly you have given your fanciful brethren a thrust which will make you suspected of beginning to be a little tinctured with our views. Our arguments, which you appear to have read in part, it seems, have brought you down from the fancy heaven, and so clipt your wings that you even use an expression implying doubt as to the *consciousness* of the dead: you say, "*if* conscious;" not, *though* conscious. Well, as you have done soaring to heaven with disembodied souls, through the power of the light that has been poured on your mind in reading our works, I trust you will yet be made to see that, as it is *not* "necessary to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead ascend into the heavens," so it is not necessary to suppose they are conscious till they are raised from the dead. Christ has "ascended into heaven;" this the Scriptures plainly affirm: see Luke 24: 51; Acts 1: 9–11; Heb. 1: 3; 8: 1; 9: 24, &c. Now, as Christ has ascended into heaven, it is very "necessary" that you should not only "suppose" but prove that "the souls of the righteous dead have ascended" there also, in order to be "*with* Christ." Is it not a part of your argument against us that Paul desired to depart and be *with* Christ?

METH.—Yes: "That Paul refers to himself, [as gain to die,] and what would be desirable in relation to himself, is evident from the 23d and 24th verses, 'I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better.' *** For himself, it was more desirable that he should die, and more desirable, because he should then be in a state of conscious existence with Christ."—p. 245.

EXR.—And yet you have just said that you "do not know that it is *necessary* to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead have ascended into heaven"! If they have not ascended into heaven, they are not "WITH *Christ*"; for I have proved that Christ has ascended. If these two legs of your theory are equal I cannot see it; and you may find yourself shut up to the *necessity* of proving that dead saints have ascended; in which case you will not find it so easy to dispose of Peter's affirmation, while under immediate and divine inspiration, on the day of Pentecost, that "David is not ascended into the heavens." Try again, Bro. Meth. There is nothing like effort to lay open one's eyes; and I hope a few more plunges, such as you have made, will help you to see the truth, that the dead are asleep, and will sleep till Christ returns from heaven to wake them up to consciousness and life.

METH.—"It is clear, that Moses, though his body had not been raised from the dead, was conscious at the time of the transfiguration."—p. 244.

EXR—It is equally "clear" if Moses was there in reality, and not in *vision*, that he was there "*in glory*." If not raised from the dead he was not there except in vision; for saints will *not* "appear in glory' till Christ "*changes* the vile body" and appears himself in glory: see Col. 3: 4, and Phil. 3: 20, 21. But Moses did "*appear in glory*;" see Lk. 9: 30, 31. It is "clear," then, that Moses had been raised from the dead, or that he appeared in vision of what he should be when Christ shall *actually* "come in his glory" to raise his saints, and fashion them like to his own glory. As I judge your other arguments and texts quoted, to prove the dead do know more than all the living, have been sufficiently met elsewhere, we will pass on to the subject of the eternal existence of all souls whether righteous or wicked. What admissions have you to make on this question?

METH.—"It is generally conceded that we cannot,

apart from the Scriptures, prove conclusively the immortality of the soul—neither the metaphysical nor the moral arguments in favor of its immortality amount to demonstration. But none who believe in the Bible will admit that the soul is essentially indestructible, in such a sense that it exists by a necessity of its own nature. It exists because God created it; and he who created, can, if he will, annihilate it. After all our metaphysical and moral reasoning upon the subject, if it can be shown that the Bible clearly asserts that God will annihilate the souls of the wicked, the question will be entirely settled in the minds of all who believe that it teaches what will be the destiny, in the future state, of the righteous and the wicked.

"We turn then to the Bible for entire assurance on the great question of the soul's immortality; and here is assurance found. Yet, in the Bible, we think, there is no passage which can be strictly said to declare that all human souls are immortal. Some have supposed that the account of the creation of the soul, given in Gen. 2: 7, contains an intimation of its immortality. If there be in this verse such an intimation, it must be found either in the expression, 'the Lord God . . . . breathed into his nostrils,' or in the phrases, 'breath of life,' and 'man became a living soul.' If it be in the former phrase, then the idea is that God infused a portion of himself, of his own divinity, into the human body at that time.—But few will admit this idea. Most of us think that there is more poetry than truth in the line of one of our hymns: 'Our souls are his immortal breath.' If the proof is sought in the phrases, 'breath of life,' and 'living soul,' these do not prove anything; for both of them are applied, in the first chapters of Genesis, to brutes, and prove the same thing concerning them. Thus the words in Gen. 7: 15, and in Gen. 1: 20, rendered *life*, are the same with those rendered in Gen. 2: 7, '*a living soul.*'"—pp. 247-8.

EXR.—We thank you for these admissions: they show clearly that our arguments, in the works you have read, have not been lost upon you. Such admissions are a blow at the root of the whole theory of immortal-soulism.

METH.—"The only passages in the Bible which clearly teach the endless existence of all human beings, are those which speak of the endless happiness of the righteous and the endless misery of the wicked. If then the Bible does not teach that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless, it does not teach that they shall exist forever, and the question is resolved into this, 'Shall the wicked exist forever in misery?' The Bible answers this question, we believe, affirmatively."—p. 249.

EXR.—"We believe the Bible answers this question" *negatively*. The Bible does teach the endless existence of *some* human beings in plain and positive terms; and does not leave it to be *inferred* from expressions relative to their "endless happiness." They who are accounted *worthy* to attain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, *cannot "die any more."* See Luke 20: 35, 36. That is plain; and there are many texts of like character, which may be noted in another place. Not one such assertion have you, in the Bible, in relation to the wicked.—We do not question but that "the punishment of the wicked will be endless;" but we do deny that it is endless *misery*.

METH. "It is said, 'that we have proof from various passages in the Bible that the immortality of the soul is only through faith in Christ.' John 10: 28, 'I give unto them eternal life.' 1 John 5: 12, 'He that hath the Son hath life,' are instances. John 3: 15, 36; 5: 40; 20: 31; Rom. 6: 23, and numerous other passages, are to the same purpose. If it is admitted that the phrases '*life*' in some, and '*eternal life*' in other of these passages mean only the existence of the soul forever, the question is settled. But this, the very point to be proved, is assumed by Mr. Storrs."—p. 249.

EXR.—"Mr. Storrs" has *not* "assumed" it. He has demonstrated that those phrases in many important passages mean *primarily* the existence of *the man* forever; and they cannot have any other construction put upon them without corrupting the testimony of the faithful and true witness. Take the first text in your list, in John 10: 28, "I give unto them eternal life." Does not this text clearly express eternal *existence*? What follows shows that it does; for, adds the Saviour, "they shall *never perish*." Here it is plain that *life*, *being*, in its obvious signification is what is promised, and is explained by our Lord as the opposite of perishing, or *death*. Just read it as our opposers usually explain it, and it is stript of all its beauty and force. It then reads, "I give unto them eternal *happiness*, and they shall never be *miserable*." Who, unbiassed by a preconceived notion, could believe that our blessed Lord used *figurative* language when the *literal* could have been so easily expressed? I regard it as an impeachment of his honesty and sincerity to say that he used, so uniformly, the phrases, *life*, *eternal life*, when he intended to be understood to mean *happiness*, and not life proper. But take another text—"As sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5: 21. What is "eternal life" here? Do those on your side of the question say it is eternal *happiness*?—Then its opposite, "*death*," in the text, means *misery*. Then it would read, "as sin hath reigned unto misery, even so might grace reign *** unto eternal happiness." But will the context allow any such interpretation? What had the apostle said? "By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin:*** death *reigned* from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression:" verses 12 to 14. Here the point is settled as to what Paul means by the phrase *death*; and he concludes his argument by affirming—"as sin hath *reigned* unto *death*, so might grace *reign* through righteousness unto *eternal life* by Jesus Christ our Lord." Man dies by the first Adam:

man lives again, if he ever lives at all, by the second Adam; and that life, to the righteous, is an *eternal* one. It clearly means here *existence* in conscious being. That such a life will be a happy one is true; but the phrase itself *expresses* the idea of life, or conscious *existence*, and of that "*only*." These examples are sufficient till our opponents shall do something more than *assume* that our Lord and his apostles do not mean what their words express.

METH.—"It is said, 'that the penalty of Adam's transgression was "*death*," and that death is equivalent to "extinction or cessation of being," or annihilation. We remark in reply, that *death* does not mean *extinction*, or *cessation of existence*, but *of life*. The whole force of this part of the Scripture argument of the advocates of annihilation depends upon the confusion of the two ideas, *existence* and *life*."---p. 250.

EXR.—There is no such "confusion" as you speak of in our arguments. It is only a creation of your own. We understand perfectly the difference between "existence and life;" and you, had you carefully examined what we have said on that point, would not have made the statement you have: it is only your *inference*. We may say of *man*, however, he ceases to exist *as man* in death; meaning only that he ceases to be a *living* man; not that the materials of which he was composed are out of existence.

METH.----"All will admit that the penalty of Adam's sin was '*death*:' but the point to be settled is this, Does 'death' mean 'extinction, or cessation of existence?' Mr. Storrs assumes that it does; we deny it. Life and existence are essentially different."----p. 250.

EXR.---"Mr. Storrs assumes" no such thing; but he does affirm that death is the cessation of *conscious* existence. If this were not so, it would not be death, but merely another mode of life; and could not, if there is any meaning in language, be called death. Life and existence may be essentially different; but life and *conscious* existence are not, in relation to any creature; though a living creature may not at all times be conscious.

METH.----"What was the penalty inflicted on Adam? The authors under review take the position that it was the loss of 'soul-immortality,' meaning thereby annihilation. There is not a passage in the Bible which sustains this position."---p. 252.

EXR.—We do not take the position that it was the loss of 'soul-immortality;' but that it was the *loss of life*—the life of *the man*. If any part of the man was exempt from the penalty of death it is for our opponents to prove it, and not *assume* it, as they uniformly do: and you have admitted that "there is no passage which can be strictly said to declare that all human souls are immortal:" p. 248. But the testimony is abundant that the life of *the man* was forfeited and lost by sin; and that the man is now in a perishing condition. If the soul is a part and parcel of the man, and without which he would not be man, then it must be included in the threatened death.

METH.—"We object, also, that the penalty of the law could not have been annihilation, because that penalty was not, in any sense or degree, inflicted on Adam 'in the day' of his sin. The denunciation, the penalty was, 'In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' Mr. Storrs thinks that he finds relief from the pressure of this objection in the idiomatic form of expression used in the original.—He says, 'The penalty was not, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou *shalt surely die*," but as the Hebrew language has it, "dying thou shalt die." That very day the whole man commenced dying.' Those who are but slightly acquainted with the Hebrew idiom, very well know that our version conveys precisely the meaning of the original, and Mr. Storrs' attempt to answer this objection entirely fails. The same phrase is used by God to Abimelech, in Gen. 20: 7; by Saul to Jonathan, 1 Sam. 14: 44; by Saul to Abimelech, 1 Sam. 22: 16; by Solomon to Shimei, 1 Kings 2: 37, 42,—in each of which cases it is manifest that certain and not lingering death was threatened."---pp. 252-3.

EXR.—"The penalty of the law" was *death:* and that it was *literal* death the texts you quote demonstrate: for, it was not a *spiritual* death God threatened to inflict on Abimelech; or Saul on Jonathan and Abimelech; or Solomon on Shimei: in each of these cases, and in every other where the phrase *surely die* occurs in Moses' or the prophets' writings, it means a literal death of the man; and does not include a moral or spiritual death in a solitary text, unless this in Gen. 2: 17 is an exception: and if it is an exception it is for our opponents to *prove* it such, and not *assume* it, as they uniformly do, and as you have done. While I do not admit that "Mr. Storrs' attempt to answer" the objection, that the "penalty was not in any sense or degree inflicted on Adam in the day of his sin," if that penalty was "annihilation"—as you please to call it, but which I call *death*—"entirely fails," I do admit that Mr. Storrs might have found a better explanation of the subject had he known ten years ago, when he first published his exposition, what he now knows about the Hebrew, viz.: that the Heb. preposition translated *in* has the sense of *after* and *against*, as well as *in*. The Heb. preposition is *be*, and is prefixed to *ium*, day. The text is, *be-ium: be* being the *prefix* determines as to the use of *ium, i. e., what day is meant.* The context shows *be* is used in the sense of *after:* and the text reads, "*after* the day thou eatest thereof *thou* shalt surely die." It does express *certainty*, as you say: but the certainty is not as to the *particular* day on which the penalty would be inflicted, but that it would, without fail, follow eating the forbidden fruit. God's own explanation of the threatened penalty, chap. 3: 19, shows that the whole man was embraced in it, and

that it was a return to the state he was in before his creation—"*Dust* THOU art, and *unto dust* shalt THOU return." Not, "dust *thy body* is;" but, *thou—the man.* No exception here of an *entity*, which our opponents call an *immortal soul:* a most important exception, if true, our opposers themselves being judges; for they insist upon it, though Adam's Maker is silent on the subject.

METH.—"The penalty inflicted on Adam consisted in physical and spiritual death, the former affecting the body, the latter the soul or spirit; not annihilation in either case, but a cessation of their appropriate functions."—p. 253.

EXR.—Where is your proof of this two-fold death? No where in the Bible, most assuredly. Besides, you have just said, it was "certain and not lingering death that was threatened:" and you have said, also, that the penalty could not have been what Mr. Storrs contends, "because that penalty was not, in any sense or *degree*, inflicted on Adam *in the day* of his sin." Now you contend that "the penalty inflicted on Adam was *physical* death"—the very thing Mr. Storrs contends for; but you add, "and spiritual death;" thus *adding* to the law and testimony of God. But, as you admit physical death to be a part of the penalty, was it "*in any sense or degree* inflicted on Adam *in the day* of his sin"?

METH.—"We may regard physical death as a part of the penalty, though it was not at once fully inflicted."—p. 253.

EXR.—If it was not at once *fully* inflicted, then it was a *lingering* death, which you just now said was not threatened. Thus you are compelled to eat your own words, and take precisely the ground as to physical death that you condemned Mr. Storrs for taking! Truly, "happy the man that condemneth not himself" for that which he condemneth others! He is a privileged character. Mr. Storrs said the Hebrew was, "*dying thou shalt die*"; importing a period elapsing before the penalty would be "fully inflicted"; you affirmed the Hebrew would not allow such a construction of its language, and therefore Mr. Storrs' argument "entirely fails"! Now you come forward and take the very ground you condemned in him, and say that "physical death, as a part of the penalty, was not *at once fully* inflicted"! What more, or different, had Mr. Storrs said?

METH.—"Adam, doubtless, understood the denunciation of the penalty to refer to physical death, and Paul teaches the same thing in 1 Cor. 15: 20, 22, where the statements in the 20th verse, that Christ is 'become the first-fruits of them that slept,' is conclusive proof that the death referred to in the 22d verse, 'as in Adam all die,' is physical death; else Christ was the subject of spiritual death, and a spiritual resurrection, that is, of depravity and the new-birth."—p. 253.

EXR.—Thank you, Br. Meth.; it is refreshing to hear you appeal to the law and the testimony; and that which is conclusive too, and so completely demolishes your whole fable of a *two-fold death.* "Adam understood the penalty to refer to physical death, and Paul teaches the same thing." Truth, *truth*, Br. Meth.; may the light shine more and more upon your mind.

METH.—"The other, and, as we believe, the chief part of the penalty, that which affected the soul, was inflicted in the day and at the very moment of Adam's sin. Some call this 'original sin;' others, 'native depravity'; we have called it 'spiritual death.' This Adam suffered in the day of his transgression."—p. 253.

EXR.—Do you say "Adam understood the penalty to refer to "*spiritual death?*" If so, where is the evidence of it? *Where?* Does "Paul teach" it? You have shown to the contrary conclusively in your appeal to his argument, 1 Corth. 15. Your whole position of the penalty of the Adamic law being a spiritual death is an unfounded assumption. To use your own words, p. 252, "There is not a passage in the Bible which sustains this position."

METH.—"The functions of Adam's spiritual life at once ceased; his soul was at once alienated from God. This condition he transmitted to his posterity; . . . young children exhibit, not perversity only, but depravity, long before they can understand the nature or the results of their conduct."—p. 254.

EXR.—And young pigs manifest the same. Did Adam transmit his spiritual death to them? But you are, on this point, at war with God. Listen:

"The word of the Lord came unto me again, saying, What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die."—Ezekiel, 18: 1-4.

Here God declares he will not allow any such imputation as you have cast upon him. And any text from which you *infer* the doctrine of transmitted moral death, or depravity, is perverted by such *inference.* As to the exhibition which you suppose young children make of moral depravity, you might as well conclude that Adam was created morally depraved, because, so far as we know, his first moral act was one of disobedience. Children are born into the world under the law of physical death, and commence their course in pain; no wonder they manifest uneasiness, and what you denominate moral depravity; but which can have no such character till they arrive at years to understand the nature of their acts. But this subject cannot here

be fully discussed; we will only add that the Scriptures, everywhere, represent the moral depravity and sins of men as *their own*, and not as the result of an act of Adam. But physical corruption and death are, uniformly, ascribed to "the offence of one," *viz.*, Adam the first. This shows plainly enough what was the penalty of Adam's sin, and its *only* penalty. The adding of "spiritual death" is of human invention; and has its foundation in the traditions of men, by which they have made void the law of God, and filled men's mouths with excuses for their sins. Hence, God has plainly expressed his will, by Ezekiel, that such language should no more be used. Let all beware how they persist in using it, lest they be found fighting against God.

METH.—"Our opponents claim that *many passages in the Bible teach the annihilation of the wicked*, and we claim that many passages teach their endless punishment. These two ideas are plainly contradictory, and cannot both be taught in the Bible."—p. 254.

EXR.—Why "cannot both be taught in the Bible"? Is not an eternal deprivation of life "eternal" punishment? Most assuredly it is. You, and all on your side of the question, *assume* that pain and punishment are of necessity identical. This we deny. "*Capital* punishment"—the greatest of all punishments known under human tribunals—is not the greatest because it is the greatest infliction of pain, but because it is the deprivation of life. The *capital* punishment under the law of God is the eternal deprivation of life, and is therefore eternal punishment.

What the Methodist Quarterly Review saith further on this topic, we regard as having been so often met and refuted in our publications, that we let it pass, at least for the present. What it has said on the term *aionios* is contradicted by most commentators, who are nearly unanimous in their admissions that the terms eternal, everlasting, forever, and forever and ever, are uniformly used in the Scriptures to denote the longest period of which the subject or object is capable to which they are applied. Hence they prove nothing as to the duration of the existence of wicked men or devils, unless it is first proved that they are immortal, and cannot die, or cease from conscious existence. That point our opponents *assume*, and we deny. We demand the proof. But that they have not and cannot produce. We may at another time take up the topic of the sense of *aionios* in a separate article.

—o—

MORE TRACTS.—The articles "The Gospel Benefits," and "The Gospel Faith," in this Examiner, will be issued shortly in Tracts of 10 or 12 pages each. *Price* 75 cts. per 100.

THE GOSPEL FAITH.

BY THE EDITOR.

Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints.—JUDE, 3.

THE Syriac version reads, "Maintain a conflict for the faith," &c. It will be our object first to determine what is *the faith* spoken of; and then note the importance of the apostolical exhortation, earnestly contend for it. "*The faith*," we apprehend, is expressed in the previous part of the verse, under the appellation of the "*common salvation*." It is "the faith" of salvation by or through our Lord Jesus Christ. But what is the distinctive feature of that salvation?

In answering this question, we wish to avoid the looseness which seems to pervade most men's minds when they speak of salvation, or being saved. The terms save, saved, and salvation, have a great latitude of meaning; and hence the sense of these terms will accord with the fancy, prejudice, or judgment of different individuals, according to their preconceived notions, unless we can show that they have a *definite sense*, when used in relation to man as the object of God's favor. Such a sense we believe the New Testament writers have in the use of those terms. To assist us in determining that sense, we shall bring to our aid the Syriac New Testament, as translated by Prof. Murdock, late of the Theological Institution of Andover, Mass.

Of the "Peshito Syriac Version of the New Testament," Prof. Murdock says—It "is very generally admitted to be the *oldest version* that has come down to us, of the New Testament *in any language*. It is called by the Syrians the *Peshito* version, on account of its style or character. The Syriac verb signifies to *unfold* or *spread out* that which was folded up, so that it can be seen in its true form, dimensions, and character. Hence the participle signifies *spread out, not involved or folded up, simplex* and *not duplex;* or as applied to a translation, *explicit, free from ambiguities, direct, simple, and easy to be understood.* And precisely such is, in fact, the character of this venerable version."—P. 489.

Among the principles which Prof. Murdock adopted in his translation of this version, the "5th" is, "In general, to avoid using technical theological terms, when good substitutes could be found, in order to call away attention from the *word* to the *thing*." In his illustration of this principle, he says—"*Saviour* is rendered *Vivifier*, as being more literal, for the verb properly signifies *to make alive, to vivify;* and its derivatives properly signify *life, life-giver*, or *vivifier*. These are the usual terms of the Syriac version, denoting that *salvation* which Christ bestows on fallen men."—Preface, p. 7.

In the foregoing quotation we have from necessity omitted the Syriac words, as we have no type of that character. In accordance with the principle here laid down, the Professor gives us "*life, Life-Giver*," or "*vivify* and *Vivifier*," throughout his translation, where it is *save, Saviour*, &c., in the common English version. In following his translation, we shall use the term *Life*, and *Life-Giver*, where he, in some instances, has inserted *vivify* and *Vivifier*, &c.; as these last terms have

a Latin cast, and do not as clearly express to the mere English reader the sense of the text.

With the light shed on the Scriptures by this venerable Syriac version, we shall be able to satisfy our own mind, at least, as to what "*the faith*" is, of which Jude speaks. In the first part of the verse from which our text is taken, Jude says—"My beloved, while I take all pains to write to you of our *common life*" : *Syriac*. The great theme of Jude and all the apostles was, that of "*Life*"—"*Eternal Life*," through Jesus the "*Life-Giver*." This was *the faith*, *the doctrine*, the great matter *to be believed*, the truth *to be preached*, the faith for which they were "*earnestly to contend*."

In further presenting this subject, we shall pass over, for the present, the multitude of texts in the common English version which express the same great and glorious truth, and call attention directly to the Syriac version, where *life*, *Life-Giver*, &c., occur in place of *save*, *saved*, *salvation*, and *Saviour* in our version. We begin the examination with Matthew 19: 25; where, after our Lord had spoken of the difficulty of a rich man entering into the "kingdom of God," the "disciples wondered greatly, and said: Who then can *attain to life*?" Here, attaining to *life* is the *salvation* looked for. Our version reads—"Who then can be *saved*?" *What* the salvation is, might be a matter for dispute, as that term is more or less indefinite: but *life* is a definite term, and brings us at once to the *nature* of the salvation. It is a salvation *from death, into life.*

Again, Matt. 27: 42; when Jesus hung upon the cross, our translation reads—"He *saved* others: himself he cannot save." The Syriac has it—"He *gave life* to others; his *own life* he cannot *preserve*." This version is truly *open*, and easy to be understood. He gave *life* to several during his ministry; and that which determined the Scribes and Pharisees to put him to death, at all hazards, was the fact that he *gave life* to Lazarus, who had been dead four days: see John 11: 48–53. He was a *Life-Giver.*

In John 3: 17, our translation reads, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be *saved*." The Syriac—"That the world *might live* by means of him" Here the nature of the salvation is clearly expressed. and no doubt is left on the mind as to its real character. It is *life*—that's what the world, the *dying* world need; and Christ came that they *might live.*

Acts 2: 21, reads—"Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be *saved*." The Syriac—"*Shall live.*" Thus showing that *Life* is the great proffered blessing to the human race; and that the doctrine of *life*, through Jesus, is "*the faith* delivered to the saints," and which they are to maintain, earnestly contending for it.

Acts 4: 12, reads—"There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be *saved*." The Syriac—"There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live*." Here, as in the previous texts, there is a definiteness that forms a firm basis for faith. The salvation is *life*. Who is it that gives this *life?*

Acts, 5: 31—"Him [Jesus, who was raised *from the dead*] hath God exalted to be a Prince and a *Saviour*." Syriac—"Him hath God established as a head and *Life-Giver*." Jesus, Messiah, *died*—God raised him from the dead and made him "*head*" of another *life*, even an endless life, and constituted him the *Life-Giver;* he is to bestow that life of which he is now the fountain. It is not in ourselves, but in him who *was dead*, but is *alive again*, and lives forevermore; who also has "the *keys* of death and hades."

When the angels directed Cornelius to send for Peter, as related Acts 11: 14, he said—"Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be *saved*." The Syriac reads—"He will utter to thee discourses, by which thou *wilt live*," &c. Here again the nature of the salvation is definite: it is *life*. And our translation so construes the salvation, verse 18, when those who heard Peter's relation of the matter said—"Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance *unto life*."

Acts 13: 26, Paul in addressing the "children of the stock of Abraham," &c., saith—"To you is the word of this *salvation* sent." Syriac—"To you is *this word of life* sent." Again in the same chapter, v. 47, Paul saith—"That thou shouldest be for *salvation* to the ends of the earth." Syriac—"That thou shouldest be for *life*," &c. In the previous verse, he had said to the blaspheming Jews—"Seeing you judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." The salvation, then, is "everlasting *life*."

In corrupting the Gospel, Acts 15: 1, some said, "Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be *saved*." Syriac—"Ye cannot have *life*." And when this matter was under discussion in the council of apostles and elders at Jerusalem, at verse 11, Simon said, as the Syriac reads—"We believe that we, as well as they, are to *have life* by the grace of our Lord Jesus Messiah." The great theme was *life*. Well did Peter answer Jesus, when he asked the twelve, John 6th, "Will ye also go away?" "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of *eternal life*." That was "*the faith*"—the doctrine "once delivered to the saints."

When the maid possessed of a spirit of divination followed Paul and Silas, Acts 16: 17, she said—"These men are the servants of the Most High God, and they announce to you the *way of life*." She understood what they preached; it was about *Life*. Though this spirit, on this occasion, spoke the truth—as "rapping spirits" sometimes do in these days—yet "Paul was indignant" [Syriac] and refused to suffer such *liars* to testify, and commanded it to depart. For this act, Paul and Silas were whipped and cast into prison. But happy in the hope *of life*, they praised God in their chains and dungeon. The jailor was convicted, and came trembling before the apostles and said—"What must I do that I may *have life?*" *Syriac.* How came his first inquiry to be about *life?* Clearly, because he understood that was the grand theme of the apostles' preaching. They answer him—"Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, and thou wilt *have life*," &c. Here is clearness, beauty, and force. There is no vague and indefinite something, under a general term, but a specific one is used, which brings us at once to the nature of the Gospel salvation. It is, obtaining *life.*

Rom. 1: 16, Paul says—"I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to

all who believe it." *Syriac.* Again, chap. 10: 1, he saith of Israel—"The desire of my heart, and my intercession with God for them is, that they might *have life.*" And in the same chapter, verse 9, he states the conditions of the proffered blessing, thus—"If thou shalt confess with thy mouth our Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, *thou shalt live.*" And at the thirteenth verse he saith—"Every one that shall call on the name of the Lord, will have *life.*" In speaking of the stumbling of Israel, chap. 11: 11, he saith—"By their stumbling, *life* hath come to the Gentiles." *Syriac.* In chapter 13: 11, Paul, exhorting to wakefulness, saith—"For now *our life* hath come nearer to us, than when we believed." Eternal life is only actually bestowed at the resurrection unto life, at Christ's return from heaven. Every day brings it nearer; and that consideration should arouse us from all stupidity, and excite us to diligence. All these expressions, as found in the Syriac, go to show the great idea of *salvation* as it lay in the apostle's mind—it was the "*one idea*" of *Life.*

We now proceed to his other epistles. 1 Corth. 1: 18—"Our discourse concerning the cross is to them who *perish* foolishness; but to us who *live* it is the energy of God." In chap. 10: 33, speaking of his course as a preacher, he says—"I do not seek what is profitable to me, but what is profitable to many, that they *may live.*" Chap. 15: 1, 2, he saith—"I make known unto you, my brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, and which you received, and in which ye stand, and *by which ye have life.*" 2 Corth. 1: 6—"Whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation, and for *your life.*" Chap. 2: 15—"Through the Messiah, we are unto God a sweet odor, in them that *live*, and in them that perish," &c. Chap. 7: 10—"For sorrowing on account of God, worketh a conversion of the soul which is not to be reversed, and a turning *unto life:* but the sorrowing of the world worketh death." To the Ephesians, chap. 1: 13, Paul saith—"In whom [Messiah] ye also have heard the word of truth, which is the gospel of *your life.*" The good news, or gospel, is that of *life* to dying men. To the Philippians, 1: 28, he saith—"In nothing be ye startled by those who rise up against us; [which is] an indication of their *destruction*, and of *life* for you"; and in chap. 2: 12, he saith—"My beloved, as ye have at all times obeyed, not only when I was near to you, but now when I am far from you, *prosecute the work of your life* more abundantly," &c. The great work we have to do is to work *for life.* In chap. 3, Paul having spoken of the conduct and *end* of the wicked, and said "whose thoughts are on things of earth," adds—"But our concern is with heaven; and *from thence* we expect our *Life-Giver*, our Lord, Jesus the Messiah; who will change the body of our abasement, that it may have the likeness of the body of his glory," &c. This is a *life-giving* work: a work which "the Father, who hath *life* in himself," hath entrusted to his Son to accomplish for all that *obey* him.

1 Thess. 2: 16, Paul says the Jews "forbid us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may *have life.*" Chap. 5: 8, 9, he thus speaks—"Let us who are the children of the day be wakeful in mind, and put on the breast-plate of faith and love, and take the helmet of the *hope of life:* for God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to the acquisition *of life*, by our Lord Jesus the Messiah." The *hope* of *life* is that which sustains the Christian in all his conflicts; and is the great gospel motive to labor and suffer for the Messiah's cause: it is *life* God has set us to *acquire.*

2 Thess. 2: 10, Paul saith that the Evil One will by signs and lying wonders deceive them that perish; "because they did not receive the love of *the truth*, by which they might have *life.*" He adds—"We are bound to give thanks to God.... brethren....that God hath....chosen you unto *life*, through sanctification of the Spirit, and faith in the truth." *Life* is kept prominent as the great gift of God and object of pursuit, as well as that for which the spirit of God works in us.

Paul opens his first epistle to Timothy with the announcement that God is "*our Life-Giver.*" As he proceeds, verse 15, he says—"Faithful is the declaration, and worthy to be received, that Jesus the Messiah came into the world *to give life* to sinners." He adds, that Messiah displayed on him "all his long-suffering, for an example to them who were to believe on him unto *life eternal.*" In the next chapter, he exhorts to prayer, &c., for all men, "for this is good and acceptable before God our *life-giver*, who would have all men to *live*, and be converted to the knowledge of the truth." In chapter 4: 10, he uses this language—"We toil and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the *life-giver* of all men, especially of the believers." He directs Timothy, verse 16, "Be attentive to thyself, and to thy teaching, and persevere in them; for," saith he, "in doing this thou wilt *procure life* to thyself and to them who hear thee."

Thus the testimony is uniform in regard to the great end of the gospel; it is to call men to *life*, and bestow it upon them. The language, by this translation of the Syriac, is divested of all vagueness and speaks out to the comprehension of all minds. We will, however, present a few more places where *Saviour, save*, and *salvation*, in the common English version, are in the Syriac *Life-Giver* and *life.*

2 Tim. 1: 10, "The appearing of our *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the gospel." How forcible and plain is this language.

Chap. 2: 10—"Therefore I endure everything for the elect's sake, that they may *obtain life* in Jesus the Messiah, with eternal glory." *Life* is still the theme; and the glorious object set before us.

Chap. 3: 15—"From thy childhood thou wast taught the holy books, which can make thee wise *unto life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."

Chap. 4: 18—"My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom." One theme still—one end in view, viz.: *life—life* in the kingdom of God.

To Titus Paul writes, on opening the epistle, "In hope of eternal life....grace and peace from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus the Messiah, our Life-Giver." Chap. 2: 10, 13—"For the *life-giving* grace of God is revealed to all men; and it teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live in this world in sobriety, and in uprightness, and in the fear of God, looking for the blessed hope, ["hope of eternal life;" see chap. 1:

2] and the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and our *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah."

Chap. 3: 4–6—"When the kindness and compassion of God our *Life-Giver* was revealed.... according to his mercy....by the renovation of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly, by Jesus the Messiah, our *Life-Giver*, that we might....become heirs in the *hope of eternal life*." Thus the author and *giver of life* is clearly set before our minds; and in a manner that cannot fail to make an impression of our obligation, and of God's great mercy.

Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, speaking of angels, asks, chap. 1: 14—"Are they not all spirits of ministration, who are sent to minister on account of them who are *to inherit life?*" He asks, chap. 2: 3—"How shall we escape if we despise the things which are *our life*." &c. Again, verse 10—"It became him...[who] bringeth many sons unto glory, to perfect the *prince of their life* by suffering." How forcible are right words? All the commentaries in the world cannot make plainer the work of Messiah, and the blessing he came to give the perishing.

Chap. 5: 7–9—"When he [Jesus] was clothed in flesh, he presented supplication and entreaty, with intense invocation and with tears, to him who was able to *resuscitate* him from death; and he was heard. And tho' he was a son, yet, from the fear and sufferings he endured he learned obedience; and thus he was perfected, and became the cause of *eternal life* to all them who obey him."

Chap. 7: 25—"He is able to *vivify* [*give life*] forever, them that come to God by him, for he always *liveth*, and sendeth up prayers for them." And chap. 9: 28, Paul saith Messiah will "a second time...appear *for the life* of them who expect him." What is Messiah coming a second time for? The answer is clear—*for the life* of his followers: to give them the "*crown of life*."

James, chap. 4: 12, says—"There is one Law-Giver and Judge, who can *make alive* and [can] destroy."

Peter, in his 1st epistle, chap. 1: 9, 10, says—"That ye may receive the recompense of your faith, *the life of your souls;* that *life* about which the prophets inquired," &c.

We now come back to Jude, the point from which we started. He calls this life, which we have been tracing out, "the *common life*" of the "*beloved*." This is that which so deeply interested them all—which the saints were exhorted to lay hold of; for which they labored and suffered; for which they *hoped, believed*, and *fought;* and in the firm persuasion of possessing it, when called to lay down their lives, met death without terror, knowing that God, who cannot lie, had promised it to all who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for it.

If such, then, is "*the faith*" of the gospel, the *importance* of "*contending earnestly*" for it can hardly be magnified. The *necessity* of such a course is as apparent as that nearly all Christendom have departed from "the faith," and perverted the very *words* in which the Bible presents the subject, to mean "*happiness*" instead of *life;* thus corrupting the testimony of God, and affirming that it is not *life* that man needs, but something else: yea, insisting that all men have endless life in themselves; so that he who would maintain the Bible truth on this subject must *contend earnestly* for it, and is in danger of being denounced as an "*infidel*" for believing that God, his Messiah, and the apostles, *mean what they say, and speak what they mean.* Surely, there never was a subject or topic that Christian men needed apostolical authority more to sustain them in their work, than the one we have been contemplating. "Fight the good fight of faith," said Paul to Timothy, "*lay hold on eternal life*, whereunto thou art also called." And he adds—"I give thee charge, in the sight of God....that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Tim. 6: 12–14. Can a subject of such importance be magnified above its just claims? We think not. Let us, then, "*earnestly contend for*" *it*, as "*the faith once delivered to the saints.*" Let those be admonished who *assume* that man has immortality or endless life in himself, that they are not by such a course, contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, but for a fable imposed upon them by tradition and the corruption of the words of God. May they quickly have their eyes open to see the truth, and be able to defend it.

—o—

GOSPEL BENEFITS.

BY THE EDITOR.

"God will render to every man according to his deeds: *To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor, and immortality, eternal life.*"—Rom. ii. 6, 7.

Our object in the remarks we make upon this text will be, just to examine the nature or character of this cluster of benefits presented for our attainment, and then point out the means by which we may make them our own.

I. THE NATURE OR CHARACTER OF THE BENEFITS PRESENTED IN OUR TEXT.

1. "*Glory.*"—Greek, *Doxan.* The term *glory*, is one often used, and generally includes in the mind the ideas of excellence and happiness: or something splendid, connected with much enjoyment. As the glory spoken of in our text is something to be attained in the future, and after effort on our part in the present time, it is worth while to endeavor to get as clear a conception of it as may be.

We regard it as that "*change*," of which the Scriptures speak, to be experienced by the saints at the second advent of Christ. Or, in other words, that change to be wrought at the resurrection from among the dead, *viz.:* the resurrection of the just. Paul informs us, 1 Cor. xv. 43: "They are sown in *dishonor*, they arise in *glory*."—Syriac.

The present state of man is one of dishonor, because one of *corruption.* Great pains are now taken to adorn our persons—to make ourselves look beautiful; i. e., *glorious.* But after all the labor and toil, corruption prevails—the most beautiful form and countenance is changed, its appearance becomes offensive, and we willingly lay it away from our sight. "They are sown in *dishonor.*" But the followers of Christ will be raised *in glory.*

How shall we obtain an idea of the glory to be

attained? Paul informs us, Phil. iii. 21, that "Our *Life-giver*, the Lord Jesus Christ," will come "*from* heaven;" and that *then* he shall *change* our vile body, (or, body of our abasement—Syriac) that it may be fashioned like unto his *glorious* body," (or the body of *his glory*.—Syriac.) But how can we get an idea of that glory which Jesus possesses? Paul has, in this text, given us the *pattern* of the glory, and Peter shall give us the clue to its full discovery: 2 Peter. i. 16–18. Peter says,—"We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you *the power* and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye-witnesses* of his *majesty;* for he received from God the Father, honor and *glory*, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased; and this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." Another eye-witness of the same manifestation, *viz.*, John, says,—"We beheld *his glory*, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." John i. 14.

We will now turn to the manifestation of that glory, as recorded by Matthew, chap. xvii 1: "Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was *transfigured* before them, (Syriac — was *changed* before them,) and *his face did shine as the sun*, and his raiment was white as the light." Here, in this *vision*, was the manifestation of "his *glorious* body," *like unto which*, Paul tells us, "our vile bodies shall" be "*changed*" when Christ "comes *from* heaven." Surely here is *glory* enough to satisfy our largest desires. The sight of it in *vision*, made Peter say, "Lord, *it is good for us to be here.*" O, how satisfying the sight, and how much more so the realization when "vision" will be swallowed up in the *reality*. Such is the *glory* presented as one of the benefits of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

2. "*Honor*"—Greek, *Timeen.* "A state of honor, *dignity:* a distinguished mark of favor." Such is the state to which the followers of Christ are to be exalted. "*A Royal Priesthood*;" to be "*kings and priests unto God and the Lamb*," to "*reign* on *the earth*," and "over the nations." This is what Christ has promised those who obey him; and the Scriptures everywhere confirm the same thing. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." Rev. iii. 21. Christ's *own* throne is "the throne of his father David," which Jehovah has sworn to give him, and which will be bestowed upon him when the judgment is executed, or in a process of execution upon the "*fourth*" dynasty of rulers on earth, symbolized by a "dreadful and terrible beast." That beast is to be slain—the body of rulers overthrown and destroyed; then one is seen coming in the "clouds of heaven," who is "like the Son of Man;" and he "came to the Ancient of days, * * * and there was given *him dominion*, and *glory*, and *a kingdom*, that all people, nations, and tongues, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 13, 14. This dominion and kingdom is that in which Christ has promised his followers a share: and "judgment" is to be "given to the saints of the Most High," when the "*time*" has come "that the saints possess the kingdom;" verse 22: then "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, (or the greatness of the kings—Septuagint,) under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him;" verse 27.

Such is the *Royal Honor* presented to our faith, as one of the grand motives to a right course of action in our present state of trial. Men are amazingly influenced by what they call "a sense of honor;" and to occupy some important post of trust where their honor can be conspicuous, is the ambition of many minds. No sacrifice, no suffering, no effort is spared, if they have evidence of the possibility of attaining the desired eminence. What an honor, in their estimation, to be President of the United States, though the term of office is a few short years, and though they may die before even that short period terminates; while the honor proffered the followers of Christ, is an honor never to pass away, nor to be changed into other hands, or to cease by death, as we shall shortly see. Let us suppose that all the honor ever possessed by Kings, Emperors, Governors, and Presidents, could be concentrated on *one man*, and that his life could be prolonged to a period equal to the combined years that have been occupied by the entire race of Adam; even then in splendor and duration it would fall infinitely short of that of *one* saint who shall become a king in the Empire of Jesus Christ! Let then the men of earth, or *worldly men*, seek their dying honors, which so soon fade away; the Christian has a "*far more exceeding*," even "an eternal weight of honor," *reserved* in store, soon to be conferred upon him, if found possessing the required characteristics. Here then is motive sufficient to stimulate the most desponding child of God. Take courage, brother: you are shortly to wear a kingly crown, and wear it for ever and ever. Lift up thy head, then, and faint not at any trials or sufferings you may be called to endure now.

3. "*Immortality.*"—Greek, *Aphtharsian.* "*Incorruptibility:*" a state opposed to our present state, which is corruptible, mortal, dying. This incorruptible state, proffered in our text, is essential to *confirm* us in the glory and honor previously noticed. Without this, that glory might fade away—that honor have an end. With this, they are both made *eternal.*

The apostle here clearly shows that men are not possessed of immortality by creation, or birth; and he shows also that it is a favor to be conferred on those only who pursue a defined course. He had stated in the previous chapter, that men "professing themselves wise, became fools, and changed the glory of the *uncorruptible God* into an image made like to *corruptible* man," &c. Little did he then know of the folly which was to be developed in after times, by an attempt to make it appear that man is *incorruptible*, like God. Such "changing the truth of God into a lie," by which "the creature" *is* "worshipped and served more than the Creator," remained to be developed as the Man of Sin should begin to be manifested. Now, men affirm that they are "immortal"—incorruptible like God! True, they admit their *bodies* will die; but the *essential man*, they affirm, is "immortal, and can never die; thus making "void the word of God through their tradition."

Man is not inherently immortal, or incorruptible,

in whole or in part. Not one solitary text in the Bible affirms any such thing, but the reverse. Let that fact satisfy the believer in the Scriptures. Immortality is a gift, dependent on the will of the giver—God, and on the *action* of him who shall partake of it. Paul informs us *when* it will be conferred, and *how;* viz., "At the last trump," and by "the resurrection," for, saith he, "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*" —*aphtharsian;* the same word employed in our text. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. xv. 52–54. And this victory, which "God *giveth*," is "*through* our Lord Jesus Christ." Here is the true source of immortality, and the time when it will be attained. Let all remember this and lay aside that pride which possesses men's hearts from a fancied notion of inherent immortality.

4. "Eternal life," *zoeenaionion:* "life eternal." This is the climax of the whole, and securing the whole. What corruptible, dying man, most of all needs, is life—an unending life. That is here promised to such as accept the conditions of the offered benefit.

We understand *life* here, in its most obvious sense, of conscious being—or that state of being appropriate to a sentient creature—a being that has the faculty of perception. To give to the term life a *figurative* sense without a shadow of reason, except that which originates in the traditions of men, who affirm that *all men*, irrespective of moral character, are in possession of existence that shall never end, we regard as a corruption of the word of God —a making void the testimony of the faithful and true Witness, who saith, "I am come that they might have *life;*" John x. 10; and who furthermore declares, "I am the way, the truth, and *the life;*" John xiv. 6; all of which is confirmed by John, who saith, "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son: and *this is the record* that God hath given unto us *eternal life*, and *this life* is *in* his Son;" not in ourselves, as the theory of man's natural and essential immortality affirms it to be. "He that hath the Son hath *life;* he that hath not the Son of God *hath not life.*" 1 John, v. 11, 12.

To suppose that the inspired authors of the Bible almost uniformly speak in *figurative* language, when presenting the great crowning benefit of the work and mediation of the Son of God, is a position of fearful presumption, and an unfounded assumption. If the Holy Spirit, who inspired holy men to speak, had intended *happiness* as the natural immortal-soul theorists maintain, as the crowning blessing, it would have been equally easy to have used the terms *makarioi, makarismos*, as Paul does, Rom. iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; where these words are translated "*blessed*," and "*blessedness*," and have the proper signification of *happy* and *happiness.* But *zoee* is the emphatic term selected by the Holy Spirit as expressive of that glorious reward God has *promised* to those who obey him. This fact is sufficient to condemn forever, the perversion resorted to in keeping up the theory that man is an immortal being. Man is a *dying, corruptible* creature; God offers him eternal *zoee*, life; not merely *makarismos*—happiness; though having eternal life, he will be eternally happy—that follows as a matter of course.

Let learned and unlearned perverters of the testimony of the Spirit of God, cease making "God a liar," by saying he does not mean *zoee*, but *makarismos*, when he uniformly employs the former term in presenting the great climax of proffered benefits, for the encouragement of dying men, and to stimulate them to suffer, if need be, even unto death now, that they may attain unto *zoee aionion*—'life eternal.' Let the simplicity in which the Gospel approaches us, with its offered benefits, stand in all its purity and plainness, and darken no longer the counsel of God by perverting his words and making them void by traditions. *Life—eternal life—to live forever—not die any more*, is the grand theme with which the Gospel salutes our ears. Joyful sound to dying men. Let them heed it.

Having presented as clearly as our limits will allow, the glorious cluster of benefits presented by our text, we proceed to notice,

II. THE MEANS BY WHICH WE MAY MAKE THE BENEFITS OUR OWN.

This we shall do only so far as suggested by the text. That teaches us they are to be *sought for;* and informs us *how* to "*seek for*" them.

1. *We must "seek for" them.* Men do not *seek for* that which they have already in possession. Immortality, equally with the glory and honor, is in the future, and is to be attained only by those who *seek for* it. The idea of the original is—*to acquire by labor*, or *work.* It is not an idle *wish*, that will give us possession of those glorious benefits, but earnest *application*; which leads us to notice,

2. *How we are to seek for them.* (1.) By "*well-doing.*" It is not all doing that will give us a title; it is a *specific* kind of *effort:* it is working "*the work of God;*" or that which he has assigned to us, and not the work which our fancy or imagination has pictured out. The first step in the work is "to believe on him whom God hath sent," viz., Jesus: John vi. 29. Believing on him he becomes the source of that *energy* by which we labor; he becomes the *pattern* after which we are to labor, and by which all our work is to be tested. This makes *faith* not that unmeaning and indefinite matter which seems to characterize much of the theology of the religionists of this age. Their faith is, in fact, a *do-nothing* faith: a faith which gives them license to live as they list, or according to their worldly desires. It includes little of daily self-denial and study, to possess the mind of Christ —walking as he also walked—who spent his life in doing good; and for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross—or death by crucifixion—despising the shame. A religion whose greatest study is to be respectable, and to make an appearance that shall divest it of reproach, is not the religion of Jesus the Messiah. His heart was set on doing good to *men:* not as the cant is—"to their *souls;*" but to men *as men.* Their present wants and sufferings moved his compassionate heart, and invariably called forth his exertions for their relief. His life was spent in *doing good.* Let us, in like manner, labor to benefit *men*, by instructing them, and ministering to their necessities, both of body and mind. Only in this way can we be engaged in "*well-doing*" or doing the work God demands of us, and to which the proffered benefits are promised.

(2) There must be a "*continuance* in well-doing." It is not doing well *now* and *then*, or under

some exciting sermon or missionary speech, when talent is enlisted to *force* out, as it were, *action!* No: a dead body may show signs of life under the action of a galvanic battery; but the life-principle must have a permanent existence in the man who works the work that God requires and will accept; and such a principle *continues* its life-motions in well-doing.

(3.) But there must be a "*patient* continuance in well-doing" to secure the proffered benefits. A disposition of mind that does not faint at discouragements, nor cease efforts because left to struggle *alone*. The idea conveyed by the original, is that of "remaining or staying behind when others have departed." It imports that there are discouragements—that most have passed on in their pursuits of profit, pleasure, or sensual gratification; and no longer heed the calls of injured or suffering humanity; then he who is seeking for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life, remains behind to do good; even tho' left of all, and though tempted with the strong current that has passed him, to join in their pursuits. Yes, though he may be ridiculed as being over-scrupulous, and too nice in his discriminations, he heeds the voice of God which falls on his ear above the foaming waves that rush by him, and hearing that voice he remains behind the multitude to do the work of God—that he may be Christ-like; and so attain the proffered glory. Worldly-minded professed Christians, and sensualists may count him a fool, but he has learned, "if any man will be wise" he is to "become a fool that he may be wise." "*Patience*" characterises his course, and he has the approbation of God, which outweighs all the censures of men. Shortly will he be exalted to this promised inheritance he has so earnestly and perseveringly sought for.

We see that there is an ample *motive* set before us to induce any thoughtful and reflective mind to lead a *Christ-like* life. If this motive fails we can conceive no other which could be effectual. The exhaustless store-house of God is opened before our minds, and we are permitted to gaze on glory, honor, immortality, and endless life, to arouse us to patient continuance in well-doing. "*Glory*" that is *unending*—"*honor*" that is "*unfading*"—incorruptibility, "*immortality*" never to be succeeded by corruption—a life to the utmost bound of which thought can never fly, because it is absolutely boundless! O, what a prize is here! Stop, poor, dying, careworn, and disappointed man: *stop*, and contemplate this boon, which High Heaven offers for your acceptance! What are all the sensual enjoyments after which you now pant? What are all the honors and treasures of earth, which now so command your energies, compared with the glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, we have endeavored to set before you on God's authority: Stop, poor disappointed worldling, stop, and think on these things.

Christian, does thy zeal and activity correspond with the amazing mercy and glorious prize set before thee? O, how much reason have we to humble ourselves, that such amazing benefits no more command our thoughts, our time, our talents, and our energies in doing the work of God; and now, especially, when the prize is manifestly so near. A few days, or months, at most, and Christ will come "*from* heaven" to crown his followers with all these glorious benefits; and life's toils, trials, sufferings, and woes, will all be passed; and *glory, honor, immortality, eternal life*, be entered upon by you! O, how comforting, how invigorating the thought while we are yet struggling in the mighty conflict. "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly," and may we "be found of thee in peace, without spot and blameless." *Amen.*

FROM SCOTLAND.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner:

Dear Brother—I send you the following paper, humbly supposing that it may be useful to some of your readers. The circumstances in which it originated are these: A small religious magazine, called the "Evangelist," is issued monthly in this city, by a section of the Baptists, which in this number (April) contains a letter from some person signing himself "Minimus," obviously in favor of the life-views, and on this letter the editor has published some remarks, to which my attention was called by a friend. My paper concerns some statements in the Editor's portion, and I deemed it proper to read it publicly to the audience in our chapel last Sabbath afternoon, after having given a fortnight's intimation of my intention to do so, and after recommending my hearers to get the periodical and examine it, in the meantime, for themselves. I just send you the Reply, as it was read to the congregation. As I make quotations from the Journal, it seems to me unnecessary to trouble you with the whole of the Editor's remarks; I only deal with the main points, and his words given are faithfully transcribed.

W. G. Monchieff.

Edinburgh, Scotland, April 24, 1852.

Before proceeding to offer some remarks on the statements of the editor of the "Evangelist," let me make a few observations of a preliminary nature, and which seem to me needed in the circumstances.

1st. Of the person who signs his brief letter to the Editor "Minimus," I have no knowledge whatever. I am even quite unacquainted with his real name; and, while I am thankful that the writer of the letter has suggested for consideration most important questions to the Editor and the readers of the "Evangelist," it appears necessary to mention that I had not any hand in urging him to the step he has taken in penning the communication referred to.

2d. I would also note it as a sign having no small significance, that the letter of "Minimus" was admitted into the pages of the "Evangelist." The Editor, who is esteemed and loved, I believe, by all who know him, deserves and receives my admiration for having displayed so much liberality as to admit it into his periodical, and I also humbly judge that his giving it admission indicates a growing anxiety concerning what, for the sake of distinction, we are in the habit of styling the "Life-Views," among his readers; for surely had he not felt the question to be waxing into importance—the water, as it were, beginning to approach him and the system he upholds—he would scarcely

have so prominently put forth an effort to turn back the flood, or tried so early and so publicly to scare his readers from the views which, along with many others, I am endeavoring to evolve, establish, and extend, believing them to be of the greatest moment for the welfare of men, and the honor of our Lord Jesus Christ.

3d. While I thus openly, and without reserve, comment on the "Remarks" of the Editor, I wish it to be understood by all my hearers that it is not with him I have any quarrel, but with his affirmations. His statements are assailed by me because they are wrong, as far as I judge, and it is my duty, as much as it is his, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is not of controversy in itself that I ever possess any horror, but of the spirit in which it is too frequently conducted; out of controversy truth is evolved, like light from the concussion of flint and steel, and there are not better specimens of its utility and of the right temper for carrying it on, than in the epistles of Paul, on which we set most properly such an incalculable value. The periodical in which the "Remarks" stand has a circulation among many who, I have reason to believe, are anxious for truth—who are searching into the questions remarked upon in the "Evangelist," and I feel it to be my duty to render any little assistance in my power to those who attend on my ministrations, in discovering the fallacy of the statements about to engage our attention, and the scripturalness of the life and death views which are assailed.

Having delivered these observations, I proceed to remark that it was the closing words of the Editor that led me, more particularly, to think of requesting attention to his "Remarks" in this public manner. He says, "We recommend our worthy brother (*Minimus*) to a more correct definition of terms, when he will undoubtedly find it to be a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or a ceasing to be." Of course all who in any way propound such a doctrine are cruel deceivers, and you will allow they could scarcely have a heavier charge laid at their door. The assertion is not even softened, as one might have expected it to be, by some such words as "in our view," "in our opinion," or by a hint that they are unconsciously perpetrating this cruel deception; it stands boldly and nakedly forward, and summons us who are necessitated to appropriate it to ourselves, to consider what we are doing, and also the grounds on which the Editor has rested his accusation, as far as they may be exhibited in the foregoing part of his note on the letter of his correspondent.

"Cruel deception" is a sore judgment, more particularly when sent forth, as it stands, against parties whom the writer has reason to believe are just as anxious to know God's mind, and to seek the salvation of men, as he is himself. Let me observe that such condemnations are easily pronounced; they are unfortunately too common among Christian controversialists occupying both public and private stations, but at all times, and especially in an age like this, there are always not a few who, after perusing a hasty deliverance of the kind, will be inclined to turn back and see if it is warranted by the evidence which the accuser has employed to back it and give it confirmation. Our design is to do this at present, and we do it reverentially and meekly. Just let us consider for a moment that the Editor is young in controversy, as he is not far advanced in years; that he partakes of the frailty of our common humanity, and that it is our privilege to forgive and forget the unkindness of a brother in the Lord, and we will come up in a right calm, and truth-loving and Christian spirit, to weigh and discuss the remarks he has given us.

"It is," says the Editor, "a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or a ceasing to be." Of course, then, it follows that a man may be really dead, and yet not dissolved, annihilated, or ceased from being; at once we grant this to be true, and shall in a few words endeavor to prove that is scriptural doctrine. In Gen. 2: 7, we read—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here then we have Scripture, very clear and very satisfactory. Man, not a part of him, was made of dust; "the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground." This man made of dust was for a short while unalive, and of course he saw not, heard not, felt not, thought not. He was truly a dead being as yet, in the sense not of having lost life, but of having never possessed it. Yet he was a man—a perfect human being; for "the Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground." But the Creator not merely resolved to make a man, but a living man; therefore we read, he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (life-causing breath) and man became a living soul." When made to breathe, the dust-formed man began for the first time to live. Moreover, he became not merely alive; he also *became* a living soul. He became this, or he grew into a living soul, or a living person, or a living human being. Such is the divine record of man's creation; it shows us his origin—from dust; the manner in which he was made alive, by being caused to breathe vital air; and finally, instead of getting a soul, in the common sense of the word, we learn that the dust-formed man when quickened grew into a living soul—he became soul alive, or just living man. Now what would be the death of this living human being, or living human soul? Just his returning to the state out of which he passed when he was divinely caused to breathe, and so to live. Stop the breathing, and you bring life to an end; the breathing process made him alive, the non-breathing will result in death, or then life will depart, *it* will be dissolved, annihilated, *it* will cease to be. Thus, then, the Editor is right in affirming that death is not necessarily the dissolution, the annihilation, or the ceasing of a man to be; for the man can be dead, and yet as a man remain neither dissolved nor annihilated. Life is not the man; to be alive, is man in a particular state. Adam was a man before he was alive; he could be a man after ceasing to live. But his state after death must necessarily be the same as it was before he was made alive; the unliving man could nor see, nor hear, nor feel, nor reflect, nor put forth any activity whatever. He has lost, in a word, what he received when the process of living commenced, at the moment when his Maker caused him to begin to inhale vital atmosphere. He, then, does not of necessity in death cease to be a man, but he is a

man without breath; and without breath, he is a man, a soul, without life; and whether he shall ever be really dissolved, or annihilated as a man, or as a soul, is a different question, and one we apprehend that has not much importance attached to it. To return to the state in which Adam was before he breathed, is death enough; it will gain the same ends that might be effected by a perfect dissolution of the organization, and it will matter therefore very little whether the man should be preserved an everlasting mummy, or have the elements of his being scattered by decomposition to the winds and the desert. Let him expire, let his life decay, and he is done entirely, till God Almighty shall restore him to life, and its functions and experiences. So far from disputing the Editor's doctrine on this point, we adopt it, and find in his own words an ample and most satisfactory admission, on the one side of the controversy, of all that we contend for; we find him delivering to us the very doctrine which he obviously wishes to condemn. Near the commencement of his Remarks, he says, "Life or vital existence stands opposed, not to the dissolution of vegetable or animal structure, but rather to their existence in their (or rather *as*, we think he means to say) merely material structures. Things though void of life, still exist—they are not dissolved in the loss of life. A slaughtered animal is not dissolved by being killed; it may be dissolved by after process, but so may it be preserved, and so with every living creature. It is therefore contrary to all experience, fact, and reason, to teach that the loss of life is dissolution." He affirms that "it is a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or ceasing to be." Well now, grant all this; what does the Editor teach us death is? This most assuredly—that the living form, that the being man shall be deprived of life, but he shall not be dissolved, annihilated, or caused to cease from being. He shall, or may be, preserved entire, but without life; he shall, or may be, in existence as a man, but a man void of life! We see no call to push forward in the meantime the fact that the man himself, as we shall yet demonstrate, shall be dissolved, or annihilated, as the *result* of death; grant that he shall, as the Editor says, exist, but void of life, and of course deprived of all its functions, and capacities, and experiences, and everything we demand is conceded—the man to all intents and purposes is done, is obliterated from being. The man, if you please, still is, but he lives not; the being, if you please, is there yet, but he is like a clod or a stone.

In the garden of Eden, the Tempter said to our parent Eve, "Ye shall not surely die." Did he mean, ye shall not surely be dissolved or annihilated? Did he mean, ye may lose your life, but ye will not be dissolved as a human being? He certainly meant, ye shall not—ye cannot lose your lives; as to the after possible or impossible results of life-losing, he had not occasion to give himself much concern, neither surely had Eve who listened to his fatal words. Without life, what mattered it whether our first parents remained forever undissolved or unannihilated? When God says, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," or, the man that sinneth he shall die, the doctrine of the Editor is, that it is a cruel deception to tell sinners that death to them is dissolution, though they assuredly will cease to be alive; that they shall cease to be, though they may depart from living being. Might we not turn round and tell this good man, "Brother, you are concerned about a trifle; you are turning the attention of your readers from death to its ordinary consequences; you are, we fear, giving sinners encouragement to misunderstand God's word, which threatens death, or life-losing, as the penalty of persevering impenitence, by leading them to see nothing real, or to see what is not the truth, in the threatening, simply because death is not necessarily the dissolution of a human being; if it shall be the dissolution of the sinner's life—the annihilation of him as a quickened, thinking, feeling agent, what will be the difference to him whether he shall be dissolved or annihilated as a man or no? if he is a *living* man no more, what though he should continue miraculously preserved a man---an undecomposed corpse---forever?"

Take, for instance, the Editor's own illustration, and the force of our reasoning, if yet necessary, may be a little more clearly discovered. "A slaughtered animal," he says, "is not dissolved by being killed; it may be dissolved by after process, but so may it be preserved; and so with every living creature." An animal, say a lamb, is deprived of life when it is slaughtered or killed---this is its death. Is not, we ask, the lamb as effectually to all intents destroyed in its sensations, consciousness, desires, pains, and pleasures, when lying stiff after the fatal blow, as it would be if it were dissipated by corruption or consumed in a wasting furnace? So with man, who in constitution and mode of life is essentially like the inferior organized tribes, for "all are of the dust;" death deprives him of life, and all its voluntary powers, and to himself it can matter nothing what becomes of him, after the vital energy has been withdrawn. Death quenches the vivifying spark; posterior corruption may devour the frame, the human organization which is moved and vitalized so wonderously while the breathing process is maintained.

The common idea, no doubt held by the Editor as well as many others, that man can die and yet be perfectly alive, that he can perish and yet be preserved to all intents as entire as if he had not perished, is sadly at variance, as we judge, with a sound view of his nature as given by his Creator in Gen. 2: 7, and with multitudes of passages of the plainest order in the sacred volume, such as "man"---not a part of him, merely—"man dieth and wasteth away, man giveth up the ghost (or expires), and where is he?" "man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more;" "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence;" "the dead know not anything;" and "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." If death is the extinction of life, then after death men are lifeless; if in any sense they remain alive, they have not died. It is a perversion of terms, in our view, to say so, and the resurrection of men to life is more of a delusion than a reality; it is a returning to life when life has never been lost; the rebuilding of a fabric that has never in fact been laid prostrate!

But the argument would be left incomplete, were we to pause with what has been adduced for consideration. We shall therefore show that not merely is life to be withdrawn, but that the man shall be dissolved, annihilated, or made to cease

from being. This will sweep away the last refuge, and give us a clear insight into the doom of the ungodly—"the wages of sin is death."

1st. Mark how the Eternal describes the doom or the death. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19. Observe it is THOU—the entire man: unto dust shalt thou return. Here is no promise that the human organization, or the dust-made man, shall be preserved; on the contrary, there is an explicit intimation that the very elements of his being shall be separated and scattered after death. *The dust after dissolution, is no more a man than the dust was before the Almighty former made it into our first parent.* When dust only remains, and dust only shall, where is the man?

2d. We read also in Ps. 37: 20—"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume. into smoke shall they consume away." When a lamb is burned up on an altar, are the smoke and ashes the lamb? No, the lamb is gone. dissolved. annihilated; smoke and ashes only now remain. Who would call the smoke and ashes a lamb? The animal indisputably is as truly out of existence as if it had never been. And so shall it be with the enemies of the King of heaven; "they shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away."

3d. We read, "He will burn up the chaff (the ungodly) with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3: 12. Put a handful of chaff into a furnace, and where is it in a moment or two? As chaff, it is destroyed. It is mere trifling to tell us the ashes remain. for we reply the ashes of chaff are not chaff. In like manner, we are here taught, sinners are to be consumed. and burnt up like chaff in resistless flames. The condemned are not unquenchable, for they are compared to chaff, which is most burnable and destructible; the fire. not the men. is unquenchable, and its action is resistless. When the miserable sons of guilt are thrown into the final devouring flames, where will they soon be? Preserved? no; but dead. and dissolved; the men will cease to be, though their ashes may remain, silent monuments of the displeasure of Heaven. Their end is destruction. and it cannot be more fully and awfully described than in these words in Isaiah 41: 11. "Behold all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing, and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee; they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought."

It is not, therefore, we respectfully suggest, "a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or ceasing to be." They shall cease to live, who continue to oppose the Lamb; they as men shall be utterly destroyed, burnt up, as the prophet says, root and branch; they shall vanish like the blossoms of the last spring, or the leaves of the last autumn.

Were we to assure men they will not be dissolved, or that they will not cease to be, we might be uttering what was certainly unscriptural, yet the deviation from truth would only be trifling in its nature; were we, however, to affirm that they shall be dead and yet alive—destroyed, and nevertheless preserved—that they will perish and yet remain—be killed and continue in conscious activity—be consumed by fire and yet be perfect in being after all, we would assuredly be guilty of uttering what seem to us great absurdities. and melancholy perversions of the word of truth. Having a desire to see men enlightened as to the result of a course of sin ("the end of these things is death") and to see them look up to the life-giving Redeemer as their only hope, we proclaim with a loud voice, that unless men eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man they shall not live forever. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

The conductor of the "Evangelist" is a Baptist, and to him, and to all who agree with him regarding the duty of immersion, I feel that our views of life and death ought to have an interest, and that they ought in consistency to be received by them at once. Why do beloved Baptist brethren practice and contend for immersion, in opposition to sprinkling and pouring? Simply because the Greek words bapto and baptizo mean literally to immerse, or plunge. and never to sprinkle or pour. They insist on the literal, the primary sense of the terms, and so do we in regard to such words as life, death. perdition. and destruction. When it is said the blessed Redeemer came to give life to the world, we understand by life, not happiness, but just what it naturally means; when we find it recorded, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life," we understand that we were exposed to a literal and hopeless perdition of being, and that now through Jesus, we may obtain a literal eternal duration of being. And why? Just because the word perish is the opposite of preserve; and everlasting life is literally a ceaseless duration of conscious existence. Life no more means happiness in its radical sense, than baptizing means sprinkling a few drops of water on a child or any other object; death no more means life in misery, than pouring some water on a man means dipping him in that element. We, like the Baptists, insist on the literal, since we are never warned to refrain from understanding the words in any other way than their ordinary sense. We demand that life shall be life, and death death, and we have no better reason than this—the language means what we affirm, just as the Greek word bapto, for example, signifies to plunge. as they correctly affirm it does. If there is a Baptist here who is not in favor of the life-views, I presume to say to him, "Friend, if you are an advocate of immersion because the Greek words describing the act in the ordinance signify to immerse, and I know of no other safe ground you can occupy. why not begin and understand the terms life and death in the same proper manner? Why change the meaning of life into happiness, when that is not the radical meaning of the word, and when your common sense will teach you that so far from life and happiness being exchangeable terms, we every day speak of happy lives, and of miserable lives? Why change death into life in misery, when the very idea of death excludes suffering entirely? Why deny the honor to Jesus of being the life-giver, the only immortalizer—as as well as the fountain of happiness to his disciples? Why affirm that his opposers shall live forever in misery, when he declares that they are to be burned up like chaff, and like withered vine branches Act on Baptist principles of interpretation, and I advise you to do so because I judge

them sound; and in doing so, I humbly believe you will find a satisfaction to your mind which you would not exchange for continents of gold.

There is only one other part of the "Remarks" which seems to call for any observation from us, and that is this: "We remind our friend that the Scriptures in many instances predicate death of men when actually living in sin, as in Eph. 2: 1–5; and if in face of this our correspondent still holds that it 'has never been shown that death stands for a state of misery or sinfulness, apart from what he calls the idea of literal destruction, we cannot help him." We solicit attention to this passage, in order to meet a difficulty arising out of the fact mentioned by the Editor, that men living in sin are in the Bible sometimes spoken of as dead. His idea, and a common objection is this—since men now are spoken of as dead, while confessedly alive in sin and perhaps in misery, the Scripture may by "death," when applied to the end of the wicked, describe not a state of cessation from being, but merely a condition of conscious existence similar to the present one of sinful men, though more intensified in guiltiness and wretchedness.

1st. Since "death" is the term descriptive of the final doom of sinful men, it seems unaccountable that that term should have been employed at all, if its real and natural meaning is to have no fulfillment in their case hereafter. The term is popularly interpreted to mean misery or torment, not what we generally understand it to import, a state in which misery is perfectly impossible; and if misery or torment is to be the end of the wicked, we confess ourselves at a loss to tell why the words death, destruction, and perdition were ever used in the threatening announcements. The Greeks had terms as powerful as ours to express suffering—awful, increasing, and prolonged; and it appears worthy of note that the sacred writers, if they intended to express misery as the doom of the godless, have universally chosen language which, when accurately explained, never conveys that idea, and have universally selected terms such as death and destruction, which must be understood to express, when explained in their natural sense, the very opposite of what they were intended to intimate, and all this, moreover, without having even so much as once guarded us against understanding them differently from their common and universally known acceptation. How are we to explain this? Shall we say they were misled? Far be it from us to harbor such a thought, even for a moment. Shall we say they were mistaken? No, we cannot do this any more than the former. What shall we declare, save this? that they used death because they meant death, and destruction because it was their design to threaten, not a state of lasting and awful misery, but cessation from being itself in the most terrible circumstances.

2d. It is worthy of inquiry whether the description of sinners as "*dead*" does not rather have a *prospective* reference, than afford any delineation of their present state. In other words, does the Bible mean that to be sinful and unhappy is to be dead? or rather does it not describe persons in this condition as dead, inasmuch as they are going on to death;—they are working for the wages of sin, they are as good as dead, for they will certainly expire at last, for "the end of these things is death"? When two interpretations are presented, the one attended with least difficulty and best supported by the mode of using language in the Scripture is undeniably to be preferred; and on this ground we choose the second exposition, because it is attended with least difficulty, and helps us to discover a greater beauty, simplicity, and propriety in the holy records. Wicked, Christless men are called dead, because they are toiling for that issue; they are already under condemnation to death; they are thus dead in (rather, *by*) trespasses and sins. Dead they are in law, and they will ere long be dead, destroyed, *in fact*; their names are not in the book of life—that is, they are on the list of the condemned; they are heirs of irremediable perdition. Thus we understand the designation "dead," in our judgment *looks forward*, so that from it we may learn prophetically the close of a sinful career. Language similar to this is not unknown in the Bible, where its import can scarcely be disputed, as for instance, Gen. 20: 3—"But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold thou art but a dead man, for (or on account of) the woman which thou hast taken, for she is a man's wife." Exod. 12: 33–"And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste, for they said, we be all dead men." Rom. 5: 15—"For if through the offence of one many be dead," *i. e.* doomed to die. Rom. 8: 10—"If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin," *i. e.* it is mortal and will ere long decay in death.

Since those of the living who are heirs of the second death are pronounced "dead," we may naturally expect the word to be used in reference to those who are living, but were dead. In the first instance it had a *prospective* force; in the instances we are now about to adduce, it has a *retrospective* import. Acts, 10: 42—"It is he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead"; dead here means those who have been dead. So also in 2 Tim. 4: 1—"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." 1 Cor. 15: 35—"But some men will say, how are the dead (those who have been dead) raised up, and with what body do they come." Rev. 20: 12, 13—"And I saw the dead (those who had been dead) small and great stand before God, and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead (those who had been dead) were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead (those who had been dead) which were in it; and death and hell (margin, the *grave*) delivered up the dead (those who had been dead) which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their work."

This simple method of expounding the reference of dead, when applied to the living in two different circumstances, that is as being sometimes *prospective*, and sometimes *retrospective*, saves us from many difficulties attending the interpretation which the popular creed regarding the end of rebellious men, founded on the dogma of immortal-soulism, demands from its supporters, and shows us the perfect consistency of the different parts of the record, when announcing the doom of the impenitent, or describing their present condition as persons advancing to hopeless ruin. "Thou shalt seek them, and shall not find them." "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." "To them who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* glory and honor, (God will render) eterna llife."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER, 1852.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We thought best to send out the Examiner for October at an early day, as many of our readers have expressed an anxiety to have it forth coming. When we concluded to put it to press, we found such an accumulation of matter on hand which must lie by till November, that we finally concluded to issue the Oct. and Nov. numbers on one sheet. By doing so we shall, also, be more at liberty, during those months, to meet the calls upon us for lecturing, where we are already under obligations to go.

The large amount and variety of matter in the sheet here presented our readers, we think, cannot fail to interest them; though it is not expected that every one *can* approve all found therein.

—o—

A WORD TO SUBSCRIBERS.—One number more will complete the present volume. *All our subscribers* will bear in mind that we have but *one rule, viz.*, "*Payment in Advance:*" and "no subscription received *for less than one volume.*" When a volume is closed, therefore, unless the subscription is *renewed*, by *pre-paying* for the next volume, the Examiner is *discontinued.* So that *we* are saved the *trouble*, and our readers the *mortification* of the *dunning* system, which cannot be avoided where papers are not paid for in advance.

It is for our friends to say whether the Examiner shall still be sustained; and their voice will be heard and felt by early remittances for the next volume. Will not each of our present subscribers renew their subscription, and send us at least *one* new *paying* one? You can easily do it if you *determine* to. *Shall it be done?* The December number will probably be issued early.

Any person remitting us *one dollar*, current money, free of expense, for volume 8, (or 1853) before the first of December next, shall have a copy of each of the two double numbers, containing J. Panton Ham's works, *without charge*, except they must pay the *postage* on them. The weight of the two copies is 4 *oz.*

—o—

"BIBLE AGAINST TRADITION."—This is the title of a manuscript work originally written by Br. Aaron Ellis, New Richmond, Pa. It has been Revised and Enlarged by Br. Thomas Read, New-York, and very carefully examined by the help of Prof. Pick's Bible Students' Concordance and other works, so that it is likely to be one of the very best works that has been published on the Life and Death question, and will constitute a book of Reference of immense value to those who wish to see the whole subject presented in a connected form, and have a help at hand in all controversies on the question. Br. Ellis spent years in collecting and arranging the work, and Br. Read has spent months in Revising and Enlarging it.

In April last we gave a small portion of the first part of the work; and in this number we give another and larger portion of it, commencing where we terminated in April, taking the work in course; so that the parts presented are not *selections*, but the work as it commences and progresses. We do not think the parts given are the most interesting; but they will give an idea of what the work is to be. We should be glad to give the whole in the Examiner, but this will be impossible, as it would fill six or seven numbers. The whole ought to be published together in a permanent form; and would make a book about the size of Dolney's, as near as we can judge, if published in that form; or the size of our Miscellany, if issued 18mo.; which we think would be the most convenient. The cost of one thousand copies would vary from three to four hundred dollars; perhaps exceed, if stereotyped.

Shall it be issued? It is for those to decide who have the money to pay the expense. We have it not. If any see fit to advance the amount we pledge ourself to return it to them as fast as the sales are made, till the money is all refunded. The work would be sold, *bound*, at about *fifty* cents, as near as can now be ascertained. Let those who wish for it say at once how much they will advance immediately to have it go on; and others say how many copies they will take and pay for on delivery. Till this is done we cannot move further with it.

—o—

NOTES BY THE WAY.—We have visited and preached in several places since the last Examiner was issued; some of them with great satisfaction, and we trust with much profit to ourself and others. We shall now speak of only two or three.

PATERSON, N. J.—There has long been a work of investigation going on in that city in relation to the Life and Death question. A number of the first men in piety and respectability have had their minds exercised on the subject for a long time; mostly from reading various works that have been issued on the subject. There had been very little preaching on this doctrine till the present season; yet the truth has been steadily advancing by means of efforts of one or more who have scattered freely various works among them; and some eight or ten copies of the Examiner have been taken from the commencement of its publication. Light has been continually advancing among that people till the flame could be no longer suppressed. Some of the most active members of the Methodist E. Church openly avowed their belief that immortality was *only* through Jesus Christ, and that utter destruc-

tion is the doom of those out of Christ. This was too much for "the powers that be." Yet they hated to lose pious, official, active, paying members, and only asked the *small favor* that they would keep their views to themselves, and not promulgate them publicly. That was a price, however trifling it might appear in the eyes of men who were blessed with only small conscientiousness, the brethren spoken of could not and would *not pay*. Then no alternative remained but they must *withdraw* or be proceeded against in a formal manner by the ruling heads of the church. One brother, Wm. Ridgeway, chose to withdraw; and others sent in their class papers, declining longer to act in an official capacity in the church if Bro. Ridgeway was to be pushed out for the same faith and practice they themselves were in. The "powers that" *were* took the alarm, and entreated them to remain, and did not presume to threaten a procedure against them.—Those powers had learned by Br. Ridgeway's firmness that these brethren were not to be frightened out of their honest convictions of truth by threats of *expulsion* from the church. Hence *policy* was the "better part of valor"—a new preacher is appointed—all is smooth, Br. Ridgeway is permitted to come to the communion table! Poor *heretic* as he is! How merciful! Perhaps they would not object seriously to his "*going to heaven*." Br. R. cannot be a member of that church, but he may come to the *Lord's* table: and of course is not excluded from the kingdom of God, in their estimation, though he is from *their church!* "Your brethren *** that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the LORD be glorified; but he shall appear to your joy and they shall be ashamed." Isa. 66: 5.

Matters were in this state when we were invited to visit and preach there in July. Our first appointment was duly notified by hand bills, issued by Br. Isaac Van Blarcome, an independent believer, who does up his work in his own way. These bills were calculated to arouse attention; and as the meeting was appointed to be held in the grove, on an island in Passaic River, of easy access, many were out to hear and see during the day: we judge, more than a thousand; most of whom heard with deep attention, and eagerly sought for works on the subject, which Br. Ridgeway had taken care to supply himself with. In the evening we proclaimed *life*, through Christ *alone*, in the Odd Fellows' Hall, to a full audience.

The first day of the week following we again preached in the same Hall in the morning, and in the grove in the afternoon, to a congregation as numerous as before, we trust with good effect; but of that the day of the Lord will make manifest.—We left another appointment to be filled in four weeks.

Br. Wm. Swinburne was one of the first, if not *the first* in the Methodist E. Church there to embrace and scatter our views on the immortality question. Our interview with himself and family, Br. Van Blarcome and family, Br. Ridgeway, family, and brother, with others of like character, were happy indeed; and our heart was truly cheered on in the work of proclaiming *Life in, through, and by Christ alone.*

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y., has also been visited by us, by the special request of our brother Dr. Hahn, of that city; at whose house such as love the Lord and christian simplicity cannot but feel at home; and his wife's heart is happily with him in the work of spreading the truth. In that city we spent eight days, and preached eleven times, in a convenient Hall, which was usually well filled with deeply attentive hearers. We have never felt greater freedom and enlargement of mind than in those eleven discourses. Not one of them was to us a barren season; nor can we but believe the Spirit of God sealed the truth on some, yea many minds.

In the first part of this meeting, Elder Jesse Briggs, recently of the Baptist church in Elmira, was with us. He is an old man, of more than three score years; forty of which he has been in the ministry of the gospel. This interview was the first we had ever seen or heard of him. From himself we learned his history. When he first commenced preaching, forty years ago, he held and preached the views on immortality and the end of the wicked we now hold and preach; and for some seven or eight years openly promulgated them. Then he was blessed and happy; revivals attended him in nearly every place where he preached; which was in the now State of Maine. After awhile his ministering brethren over persuaded him not to preach *directly* on those topics; and he began to think perhaps he might get along easier just to use scripture language, and not urge his peculiar view of its sense. He tried that course for thirty or more years, still believing his first views, but not preaching them as in his first love. The consequence was, to use his own language, "I got into an awful backslidden state, and have been in *bondage* for years." At the Tent Meeting in Elmira, in June last, under the preaching of Br. Bywater and others, he heard the sound of immortality through Christ *alone*, as he received and preached it in his first love. To use his own language again, "I jumpt the Baptist walls, and feel once more *at liberty*, and have had more enjoyment in a few weeks than during many years past." Of Br. Briggs' preaching talents we know

nothing. He chose to be a *listener* while he remained with us at Canandaigua, and seemed highly delighted. May the Lord bless him, and enable him to redeem the time he has lost by so long putting his light under a bushel. Many others, we fear, are in a backslidden state from the same cause, *viz.:* hiding or denying the truth, on Life and Death, to please men, or to avoid reproach.

LETTERS.

FROM PRES. J. P. WEETHEE.

Chauncey, Ohio, August 17, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—As you are engaged in the spread of a great truth, concerning the nature and destiny of man, every item of information which involves that subject, and especially its progress, will be interesting to yourself, as well as to your readers.

I have been familiar with your writings on the Second Advent of Christ, since 1843. I then received a copy of your Six Sermons on "Life and Death:" but not regarding that doctrine a vital one, or in any way particularly connected with the coming and kingdom of our Saviour, I laid those publications aside, and applied myself to the study, and explanation, of the prophecies. I read but little on the subjects of "natural immortality," or "eternal life through Christ." Not examining these disputed points, I did not change my former views on those points, any further than to deny man the possession of natural immortality.

In 1850, my attention was called to the subject of the state of the dead, by reading of the phenomena exhibited by the "Rapping Spirits," as they were called. I had come to the conclusion some years previous, that we were between the 6th and 7th vials, when the three unclean spirits (of Rev. 16: 14), were to go forth for the deception of mankind. I saw that those spirits would profess to be the spirits of demons, or dead men. They were to work miracles, and by these wonders, draw many away from Christ.

I was satisfied that these were lying spirits, that they were not the spirits of dead men. But why not, if the souls of the dead are conscious, and are permitted to revisit the earth? This thought led me to question the consciousness, or even the existences of a disembodied spirit I then began to examine the bible on the subject, and read your views with those of others, and became satisfied that the "dead know not anything," in the fullest sense of the term; and also that the punishment of the wicked will be DEATH, not endless life in misery. Since I have been convinced of the truth of these doctrines, I have not been silent, but have proclaimed the views wherever I have travelled.

I see a beauty in the resurrection, and the advent which did not before appear. Many scriptures now seem full of meaning, which were formerly mysterious.

I have travelled very extensively among the advent believers, and my impression is, that more than three-fourths of them are persuaded of the truth of the views you are promulgating on "life and death." The two discourses I delivered last spring, at Deavertown, Ohio, had their effect. An eminent physician, embraced the views, and on my return on the 8th inst., I learned that half of the church had come out fully on the doctrine. Dr. Rieves is an elder in the church of disciples, a man who loves his bible, and is resolved to follow its teachings. A number in the church at Chauncey also believe the same doctrines. The field is large. The doctrine of "life and death." has never been preached in this region, except the few discourses by myself. *I intend to proclaim the sentiments as opportunities are afforded.*

Yours in hope.

J. P. WEETHEE.

FROM FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Spencerville, C. W., 7th month, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—Seeing in the last Examiner a hint that those late publications of thine have entailed an extra expense upon thee, the accompanying "widow's mite," is sent to help to pay postage. I wish from my heart I had more. I have read very many works, on very many subjects—from childish folly, up to the highest flights of man in philosophy and science—and I can truly say, I have never read anything that pleased so well as those *two Double Examiners.* Since reading the first, I have asked myself, I know not how often, *can anything more be said?*—Here is plain common sense, fair and candid reason, backed up by an amount of bible evidence, morally impossible to be overthrown—enough to satisfy any mind not desirous of being *willingly ignorant*—and now comes the climax of all, by the same individual. Br. Storrs, to me at least, those two expositions of all-important truth are of more worth than all the combined volumes of theology the world can produce. Thy time is precious, I know; but I could not refrain from expressing my gratitude for thy labor of love. May God, who only can reward thee aright, do so, in His own time, and own place; even in his kingdom, and that right speedily, is the fervent prayer of thy personally unknown friend, and loving brother in Christ.

FROM S. S. BREWER.

Wrentham, Mass., 1852.

Br. Storrs:—I wish to say to the lovers of truth, that read your paper, that among the multitudinous blessings and favors of our heavenly Father, next to the gift of his dear Son, do I praise him for a knowledge of the true source of immortality. O how plain repentance, and faith in Jesus; obedience, patient continuance in well doing in order to obtain glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, at the resurrection of the just. Then the poor sinner, instead of "wailing, howling, writhing in liquid fire—the moment his deathless spirit leaves his body"—sleeps in the dust of the earth till the heavens be no more, after all the horrors that imagination can clothe the papal, Christian, or heathen hell with—in order to frighten some into heaven—they sleep; and as the word of God tells the truth (which I most assuredly believe it does), those in hell don't know anything about their suffering: Job xiv. 12; Eccl. ix. 5th. So you see, dear reader, the dead saint and sinner sleep in the dust of the earth—in hell—in the grave—*hades*—where the Saviour slept: Psa. xvi. 10; Acts. ii. 31: in hell, where Paul now sleeps;

in *hades*. Just turn to the 15th chap. 1st Cor. 54 and 55 verses, where the apostle is speaking of the resurrection: "*When this mortal* shall have put on immortality—THEN shall be brought to pass the saying, Death is swallowed up in Victory—O Death where is thy sting? O Grave, [margin of the English bible; *O Hell.*] *where is thy victory?*" Clark, in his note on Math. xi. 23, admits the word *hell* comes from the Anglo Saxon *helan*—to *cover*, or *hide:* hence the *tiling*, or slating a house is called in some parts of England, (particularly Cornwall) *heling*, to this day. And the *covers* of books (in Lancashire) by the same name. One word, dear brother, ere I close, for the encouragement of all those that are engaged in holding up Christ as the *Life-Giver*. The leaven of God's truth is at work, and is *working* its clear, glorious, sanctifying influence among the different sectarians in despite of all their opposition: praise the Lord. Death, Hell, and the Devil *must die*.

—o—

FROM PARKER SAWYER.

Br. Sawyer ordered, early in April last, $100 worth of books, and sent *the cash* with his order. The following will show that he is not asleep, but at work, not laboring in vain. Let others who have the means go and do likewise. How many who have more means than Br. Sawyer has, and who profess to believe the same glorious truth, are doing next to nothing to spread the truth abroad. Shall there not be a waking up to the work?—ED. EXR.

Batavia, Kane Co., Ill., Aug. 20, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—Some valuable minds here have already been obliged to admit the force of arguments in your publications against the *natural* immortality of man, and are embracing, one after another, the Bible view of "Immortality and Eternal Life alone in Christ." Elder ———, Baptist preacher of this place is "on the way," and has ventured to preach the *destruction* of the wicked, and no immortality out of Christ, but has some difficulties on the "intermediate state" of the "dead in Christ." I have presented him with the Exr. for '50 and '51, "Dobeny," and "Miscellany," which he is reading with *great interest*. He is about 50 years of age---intelligent---pleasing in his address, and quite an influential and acceptable preacher. Distrust as to his "Orthodoxy" is awake, and he is now being proscribed by his brethren; so much so that he has now commenced an *independent* effort, aside from the church. All eyes are upon him, to see what will be the result. I am giving away more books than I sell; but the sacrifice is not *in vain*. I see no cause for discouragement. "Truth is mighty and will prevail." While I have an influence to exert and the means to use, I expect to labor for the spread of those works, and efforts which, instead of *Deifying man*, will exalt *Jesus* as the "resurrection and the life." Most truly yours,

PARKER SAWYER.

—o—

FROM NATHAN HORNADAY.

Cleremont, Ind., 1852.

Br. Storrs:—This will inform you that life and immortality through Christ has been, and now is, being taught in the central part of Indiana; although I am the only man that teaches it publicly in these parts: but there are several believers in the doctrine. Since the truth on this subject has been dug out from among the traditions of men, it has caused a great deal of light to spring up on many passages that were entirely obscure before; therefore, through the aid of your paper, and other witings, to which I have had access, I have been able to throw off the old sectarian spectacles, and look at the scriptures with my own eyes. I am a seeker after truth: opposition runs high in this country: people are taking strange positions against the doctrine I teach; and some meeting house doors have been closed against me. I have had several discussions, and expect another with a Lutheran preacher.

COMMUNICATIONS.

REPLY TO MACKNIGHT.

The following should have been inserted before now, but it was overlooked in our removal.—ED.

BR. STORRS:---With your permission, I will give a few thoughts in answer to Macknight on Luke 20: 34–37. I presume he wants to know if the resurrection of the wicked is taught in the Scripture of truth. If the doctrine is there taught, the Saviour's words in Luke 20: 34–37 will not disagree therewith. Let us examine the texts under consideration. The Sadducees thought and believed that there would be no resurrection of the dead. Hence the question, whose wife of the seven brothers would the woman be in the resurrection [33d verse], for all had her to wife. The Savior, in answering them, taught that there would be a great difference in that age to come, whereof we speak, and the present age. In this age, the children thereof marry and are given in marriage; in that age there will be no marrying or giving in marriage. In this age they *die*; in that age they will not die. He teaches that to obtain that age there must be a worthiness; also, to obtain that age there must be a resurrection from the dead. This I think was an answer to them so far, concerning the resurrection of the dead; for there is an age to come, and God's children, the worthy ones, who are dead. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and a host of others will attain to that age; hence must have a resurrection from the dead, for "God is not a God of the dead;" they must be made immortal, "to die no more," for "He is the God of the living"; for these worthy ones lived unto him, hence worthy. They will be "equal unto the angels," for they shall "die no more." They will obtain to that age which is intended for all the righteous; amen.

It is certain that the Saviour with as much plainness spoke of the "resurrection" of those "that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation," as he did of the "resurrection" of those that "had done good" to life; the latter will die no more, being worthy to obtain that age. If one part of John 5: 28, 29 is figurative, so may the other be; for as sure as some rise to life, the rest will rise to damnation---for "*all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice and *come forth*." The wicked will be brought forth to the day of wrath, to which time they are reserved. [Job 21: 29, 30; 2 Pe-

ter, 2: 9, 10, 12, 13, 17. See Jude also.] When the Saviour was on earth, a few were raised from the dead; but he told the people not to marvel at what they saw him do, for the time would come when *all* that are in their graves *shall hear his voice, and come forth*, &c. He said he had "received power from the Father to *execute* judgment also, because he is the Son of man." The Saviour, in Matt. 26: 64, assured the persecuting "high priest," who conjured him to confess whether he was Christ, the Son of God, that hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven; which would not be if there was no resurrection of the wicked, unless the priest was afterwards converted to Jesus Christ. Those that pierced him shall mourn because of him. This looks favorable to their resurrection.

When Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall sit down in the kingdom of God---in the age to come---with those who come from the east, west, north, and south—the worthy ones—the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; for they will see them in the kingdom of God, and themselves cast out; hence must have a resurrection. If there be no resurrection of the wicked, where is the use of the expression, "the resurrection of the just"? Why not the resurrection? But there is a resurrection of the unjust: and Paul assures us that he had a conscience void of offence towards God and man in making the confession that there is a "resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust."

In addition to the above, I send you a few thoughts on Eph. 2: 12, in answer to "Querist." In my opinion, the text quoted above has no particular reference to the resurrection of the dead. It appears to me that Paul is teaching that the Gentiles, who are the uncircumcision, had, previous to conversion to Christianity, no association or citizenship with the Jews, who were the circumcision. They were strangers from the *covenants* of promise, which were made to Abraham and his seed; Acts, 3: 25. Heb. 8. They were without hope of eternal life (Titus, 1: 2), which the Jews professed to have in the Scriptures. John, 5: 39. The Gentiles were without God; God had not manifested himself to them as he had to the Jews. But now, God having sent his Son into the world, and by him spoken to us, in these last days; by whom also life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel—the middle wall of partition has been broken down, so that the Gentiles can become fellow-heirs with the Jews, who have the faith of Abraham their father. Christ is therefore our peace, or made peace between us; so now we are reconciled to each other, and to our Father and his son Jesus Christ, and are one in Christ Jesus. One new man is now formed. So now the Gentiles are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, &c., of the household of God; grafted into the true olive tree. These are the other sheep brought in, to be with the Jews one fold, and to have one shepherd. It is a matter of rejoicing that the unsearchable riches of Christ was preached to the Gentiles. O, how full of instruction is this portion of sacred truth. "Querist" will see a difference between being strangers from the covenants (plural) of promise, and "being outside of the covenant" (singular.) It is my opinion, with present light, that the wicked that shall be alive at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, will by the judgments written be destroyed from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. 2 Thess. 1: 9; Matt. 13: 30, 42; Rev. 16. But those of the wicked that are dead will have a resurrection, be judged and punished at the end of the thousand years, or the day of the Lord. How can these texts be fulfilled if the wicked rise not? Matt. 3: 12. This was spoken to those wicked Sadducees, and shows that they were in danger of said punishment. Mal. 4: 1; Matt. 7: 13, 19, 23; 8: 11, 12; 12: 36, 37; Mark 9: 43–48; Acts 17: 30, 31; Rom. 2: 6–9; 1: 32; 2: 16; 2d Peter 2: 3–7; Jude 14. 15. "To execute judgment upon *all*," &c. Fire shall come down from God out of heaven, upon all the rest of the dead and devour them. Rev. 20: 4, 9. There appears to be two destructions: the first on those that are alive at the coming of Christ, who will receive at the hands of God the punishment described, and the wicked dead will rise to be punished; for every man will be rewarded according to the deeds done in his body—in other words, for his own sins, not for Adam's transgression.

Yours, in the hope of eternal life at the resurrection of the just, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. W.

RESPONSE TO MACKNIGHT.

BY VERITAS.

Br. Storrs,—Our friend Macknight's last article closes as follows:—"Now if the *wicked* get loose from this law of death, and get the wrath of God removed from them, and get a resurrection from the dead, they can sing, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' Will Veritas inform us to whom or what power this victory will be ascribed."

Here it is assumed that deliverance from the condemnation of the law and "the wrath of God," is necessarily connected with "a resurrection from the dead." Both reason and holy scripture appear to me to be plainly opposed to such a sentiment.

Whether or not a resurrection from the dead is a blessing or a curse, depends entirely on the purpose or end for which man is raised. He may be raised a thousand times without being raised either to eternal life or to a momentary happiness. After all, he may die forever. Surely if he rises "*to shame and everlasting contempt*," "*to condemnation*," to be "*cast into the lake of fire*," which "*is the second death*," as the immutable word of the Lord plainly and positively declares, he can have no part in the triumphant song of the redeemed, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory."

Reference to *all* the divine testimony concerning the doctrine of the resurrection is necessary to our understanding of the truth. Two resurrections are plainly revealed as the purpose of the Judge of all the earth. They are different both in respect to character and time. One is "to life" eternal, the other "to condemnation," and "the second death;" from which there is no deliverance. This "destruction" will be the "END" of the wicked: See John 5: 28, 29. Rev. 20: 14, 15. In respect to time, "a thousand years" will intervene: Rev. 20: 5.

M. remarks, "we being in the loins of our father Adam, died with him: this is the first *death*." He also remarks, "If a man refuse to eat of this tree, (Christ) he perishes, or dies the second time; if you will have it, the second *death*, or loses life." According to this view of the subject, the first death was our representative death in Adam; the second death is our actual death at the close of mortal life; consequently the saints, as well as the wicked, die the second death!

Our friend's theory may require such a construction, but will it stand the test of the word which abideth forever? Let us see. What is the scripture representation respecting the second death?

Among all the innumerable accounts we have in the scriptures of truth of human deaths which have occurred, do we find a single instance in which such death is denominated the *second* death? Not one. Moreover, if M. is correct, the second death has power, for a time, over the saints; which is certainly *some* power; but the word of truth declares that "on such the second death hath *no* power." Rev. 20: 6.

Again, the plain representation in Rev. 20th chap. is, that the second death will be subsequent, not only to the first, but to the general, or second resurrection, and also subsequent to the final judgment. Nor is this all the objection to our friend's theory. The casting into *the lake of fire*, not casting into *the grave*, is plainly and positively declared to be the second death. Rev. 20: 14.

M. thinks that Adam "was permitted to bring forth his seed by the justification of that seed to *life* through Jesus Christ." The term justification to life appears to me to import nothing less than *eternal life;* and that M.'s view would imply universal salvation. I see no necessity for the mediation of the Son of God for the mere temporal existence of Adam's seed. Such mediation is necessary for their deliverance from the penalty of the law, which is eternal death; all having sinned and come short of the glory of God. God hath set forth his Son to be a propitiation, or mercy-seat, not that he might be just in permitting Adam to bring forth his seed, but "that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." I think that Rom. 5: 18, must be understood, either as importing, that through the righteousness or mediation of Jesus Christ, the free offer of salvation is made to all men on condition of repentance and faith; or that as all united to the first Adam are under condemnation, so all who are united to the second Adam, by faith, are justified to life eternal. Be this as it may, the doctrine of the "resurrection" to "condemnation," of those who die in their sins, rests upon the rock of His word who has declared, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." John 5: 28, 29.

VERITAS.

ANOTHER INQUIRY.

Will those who died in the wilderness for rebellion, have a resurrection?

Our Lord Jesus saith, John 6: 49. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and *are dead*."

God had said of the rebellious Israelites who came out of Egypt, "*They shall surely die in the wilderness*." See Numbers 26: 65. This seems to be the same class our Lord speaks of, John 6th. The threatening to those rebellious ones seems to be without qualification; and it is said, "there was not a man of them left," when Moses and Eleazer numbered Israel just before Moses' death.

Paul, speaking of those who came out of Egypt, says, "With many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the *wilderness*. Now these things were our *examples*, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted." 1 Corth. 10: 5, 6. The apostle then enumerates a number of particulars in which they sinned, and the judgments that followed, and adds: "All these things happened unto them as ensamples (or *types*) and they are written for our admonition, &c.

Jude says, "The Lord having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that *believed not*." v. 5.

Paul saith, Heb. 3: 16–19, "Some when they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had *sinned*, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom swear he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that *believed not?* So we see they could not enter in *because of unbelief;*" and he adds, chap. 4: 6, 11, "Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached [the rest] entered not in because of unbelief.... Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of *unbelief*."

These texts go to show that it was the *rebellious* ones that are specially spoken of as *falling*, being *destroyed, dying* in the wilderness; so that they "*are dead*." And this phrase (*are dead*) seems to be an emphatic one; for, *first*—It is in contrast with "*not die*," v. 50; and with "*live forever*," v. 51. If "*not die*" means shall not be holden by death; and if "*live forever*" does not exclude the death that has come "upon all men," and the phrase "*are dead*" is in contrast with these, as seems evident, then it would appear that the expression "*are dead*" is used to denote their final state, and that they were then in it; and hence imports their *non* resurrection.

This view is further strengthened from the words of our Lord, in his discourse with the Sadducees on the resurrection. Luke 20: 38, he saith, God "is not the God of the dead"; that is, as the text and context clearly indicates, he is not the God of such as shall have *no resurrection;* for "*all*" who are spoken of in this text to have a resurrection, God *is* their God, and *they* are to be "*as the angels of God in heaven*." See Matt. 22: 30. It cannot be said of the "fathers in the wilderness" who "are dead" for rebellion, that God is *their God*, and that they shall be "as the angels of God in heaven"; therefore it does appear to look as if *that class* of sinners were excluded from a resurrection altogether. This may not be so; but without further light on the subject this view seems conclusive. I would like to see what could be said for and against it by some of your correspondents.

INQUIRER.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We are sorry to be obliged to lay over a number of articles which we intended to insert. We hope to do justice to all, though we may fail of it. Our friend L. Butler, of Mich., is not forgotten.

From Elon Everts.

New-Haven, Vt., *July* 4, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—I receive your valuable paper regularly. I hold dear to me those truths that it advocates. I saw the truth that man, natural, is *mortal;* that he has no soul separate from his body; and that his body with its material parts is his soul; and when his body is locked in death's inactivity, he is unconscious, his thoughts perish, he knows not anything. This I saw, and that man unregenerated, or unresurrected at Christ's second coming "riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job. xiv. 12. But I did not see the full beauty of it, at first. Although David says, "his truth shall be thy shield and buckler," Psalms 91: 4; yet I saw not what it would shield us against, so fully, till "that wicked began to be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the *working of Satan*, with *all* power, (that must be great,) and *signs* and *lying* wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in *them* that perish: *because* they *received not* the *love* of the truth, (that man is unconscious from death, till the resurrection of the body,) that they might be saved. And for this cause, (because they rejected the truth) God *shall send* them *strong delusion*, that they should *believe* a lie: that they *all* might be damned who believed not the *truth*, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2d Thes. 2: 8–12. Now that wicked is revealed by rapping and writing. Many lying signs and wonders, purporting to be the spirit of good or bad men, murderous warriors, or followers of the Prince of Peace: transforming himself into angels of light, to deceive, if possible, the very elect. O, how much we need the truth to shield us in this time of peril. Still I wish to mention one more truth that Paul is dwelling upon in this chapter, that we need heed in the love of it; that when this satanic spirit is thus revealed, it is, that the next event is, the coming of the Lord. And this is one great truth that many do not receive the love of. Let such pause when they read these awful warnings, before the delusion blinds them beyond recovery. "It is the last time, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there *many antichrists;* whereby *we know* that it is the *last time*." 1st John 2: 18.

Brother Storrs: I wish to hold fast on all those truths that we have learned; and grow in knowledge of Bible truths, as fast as in the dispensation of the opening providences of God, his prophecies and truths are revealed. Is not this right? Is it not our privilege? yea, is it not duty? Does not the Word say, "the pathway of the just is as the shining light, which shineth *more* and *more* unto the perfect day?"

I feel a deep interest in an increase of light. Still, I behold with interest the progress of the great truths that you are promulgating. But, brother, do you not pass a glance over the questions that agitate the Bible students of this day? I trust that you do, and have long expected that you would speak out. Dear brother, I sent you some pamphlets last summer, I know not that you ever received them or the accompanying letter. I would be glad to hear from you on the Seventh day Sabbath, whether you think it is binding upon man now. You say in July No. of Examiner, page 108, that you spent two Sabbaths with the brethren in Philadelphia. I ask what do you mean to be understood by Sabbaths? what day of the week do you wish to be understood? Please inform.

Brother. I am aware that I am interrogating a brother that has waged an uncompromising war upon the traditions of men, therefore I take great liberty, and trust that I shall not injure your kind feelings. No, dear brother, that I would not do; but my heart is in deep solicitude on the subject, and I feel anxious to hear from you. I doubt not but you are perfectly familiar with the history of that Horn that (Dan. 7: 25), should think to change times and laws, (of God, of course.) Is it not of importance enough to enlist a short campaign from you? May our Lord direct, as it will be for his praise and our peace. Amen.

Reply by the Editor.

Bro. Everts may be assured he does not *injure* my *feelings* by his plainness. So long as a brother manifests the *kind* spirit he does, it matters not how much he may differ from me in opinion. In answer to his interrogations, I reply, First—I use the term "Sabbath," in ordinary discourse, in the sense it is usually understood: i. e., just as I would the term "Sunday." These are the usual names by which the first day of the week is designated. But I have no favoritism to these appellations of that day. I do not insist that the first day is the Sabbath—but I do not conceive there is anything in the commands of God to prohibit my calling any day in the week by that name, if it is the known name of the day it is used to designate. As to any binding *authority* to call one day in seven *the Sabbath*, or to observe one as such, in the ordinary idea of such a day, I have no evidence that Christ or his apostles have given any. To attempt to fix the seventh part of time upon the followers of Christ as a Sabbath, and a binding institution, whether it is done by a Roman Pope, Protestant Pope, or *any other* Pope, is to usurp the authority of Christ, and thus take the *mark* of the Man of Sin. No authority for any such thing exists under the administration of Jesus the Messiah. The attempt to fix the Seventh-day Sabbath upon the followers of Christ, as of binding obligation, is of the same character as the attempt to fix upon them circumcision; and is usually accompanied with the same spirit that is recorded Acts 15: 1. That is—"Except ye keep the seventh-day Sabbath, ye cannot be saved." All are doomed to perdition that do not believe and act as they do on the subject. We are happy to know there are exceptions, and especially that Bro. Everts is an exception.

When the apostles and elders came together, at Jerusalem, to consider the matter in regard to observing the law of Moses, the decision was unanimous, that those who were "*turned to God from among the Gentiles*" were "not to be troubled"

with any such thing. See Acts 15th. Let us give the words of that memorable council, they are as follows:—

"Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, *subverting your souls*, saying, Ye must be circumcised *and keep the law;* to whom we gave no such commandment; it seemed good to us, being assembled with *one accord*, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the *Holy Ghost*, and *to us*, to lay upon you no greater burden than *these necessary things:* that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which, if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

Here is no recognition of the *Law Sabbath*, or Seventh-day Sabbath. A very strange omission if of such obligation as the advocates of that institution now maintain. But the "apostles and elders" do here affirm, that the converts "from among the Gentles," were *not* commanded to "*keep the law*," verse 24: and of course were not commanded to keep the Sabbath of the law. And Paul, who was a principal actor in that council, and in the controversy thus settled by *authority*, admonishes the Christians at Colosse "Let no man judge you * * * in respect of a holy day * * * or *of the Sabbath*," and adds—"Which are *a shadow* of things to come but the *body* is of *Christ*." He asserts that Christians were "dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world;" which latter phrase signifies "*elementary*" principles—the lowest parts of knowledge. Such was the *law* economy, as given by Moses, and which Paul affirms, in this same chapter, Christ "took out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" and also affirms that one of those things taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, was "*the Sabbath*."

Not one writer in the New-Testament countenances the idea that the Sabbath had any sanctity above any other day of the week. A Christian's whole life, and *every day* is to be consecrated to God. "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do *all* to the glory of God."

When Paul wrote to a church composed of both Jews and Gentiles, as that at Rome was, he settles this question, thus, chap. 14, he says:—"One man esteemeth one day *above* another: another esteemeth *every* day;" and he adds:—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." In the result, he says,—"Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for ye shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ."

Here was one portion of a Christian community who were Jews, and had been brought up under the law commanding the observance of the Sabbath; and though now converted they could not at once overcome all their Jewish prejudices; particularly the observance of one day above another, and Paul decides it was not necessary they should; while on the other hand, another portion of that church had been brought up Gentiles, with no observance of one day above another, and Paul affirms it was not necessary they should esteem one day more than another. Here is the true New-Testament ground to stand upon—the ground of charity and forbearance, and caution against judging one another in these matters.

We forbear entering at length into this subject, but must content ourself, at this time, with mere hints. A few words more shall conclude our remarks. If the Sabbath as given by Moses, is binding now, it is so in *all its claims and denunciations*. Let those who strenuously contend that it is *now* of binding obligation, see whether they themselves are not condemned by the Sabbath law. "Whosoever doeth *any work* in the Sabbath-day, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. 32: 15.

The Sabbath was, and still is binding on all who are *under the law*. They who are under the law, will "be judged by the law;" Rom. 2: 12. All the curses of a broken law and violated Sabbath fall upon them. "But ye," believers in Christ, "are not under the law, but under grace." "The law was given by Moses, but *grace* and truth (or the *substance*) came by Jesus Christ." John 1: 17. The law was the *shadow:* Christ is the *substance*. Hence "We which have believed do enter into rest," &c., Heb. 4: 3; we have *the substance* in distinction from the *shadow*, which was by the law of Moses.

"Tell me," saith Paul, "ye that *desire to be under the law*, do ye not hear the law?" Galatians 4: 21. He then says, "Abraham had two sons, one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the freewoman by promise." He then adds: "Which things are an allegory, (an illustration;) for these (two women) are (an illustration of) the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar * * * and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." And why are they "in bondage?" Because they adhere to the Sinai law as a covenant. But "Jerusalem which is above (represented by the freewoman) is free, which is the mother of us all" who believe in Messiah. "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him after the Spirit even as it is now." Those who will continue under the Sinai law, or return to it after once being made free, manifest the same spirit,

sooner or later, that the bondwoman's son did, viz: a persecuting spirit, showing a departure from the spirit of the Gospel of Christ and his apostles. Let them beware lest they are "cast out" with "the bondwoman and her son."

We wish Bro. Everts to understand, distinctly, that all we have said is not designed to apply to him. With him, while he continues to manifest the same spirit that is breathed in his letter, we can differ on this question and still love him as a brother. But in others who have been led under the *law Sabbath*, we have seen and been made to feel, that there is a lack of honesty and integrity, which might justly be ascribed to the Ishmaelite spirit of the bondwoman's son. If Bro. Everts, or others, sincerely think the law Sabbath binding on them, I shall be the last to condemn them; at least, so long as they manifest the spirit Bro. E. now manifests. May the God of truth and love guide him and all of us in the way of truth and life.

On the Sabbath question I have heretofore said nothing; and should still have remained silent but for Bro. Everts' appeal. I have been content to abide the apostolic injunction, "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*" I esteem it a great mercy that the providence of God has so ordered it that one day in seven is observed as a day of rest. The influence of it is good, both physically and morally. But as to any *positive* law for its observance, there is none under the Gospel economy. So I believe.

BIBLE vs. TRADITION.

BY AARON ELLIS, REVISED AND ENLARGED BY THOMAS READ, NEW-YORK.

Proof from the Bible of the Corporeal Nature and Mortality of the Soul of Man, and the Nature of his Spirit.

"I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Isa. 57: 16.

In tracing the word *soul* through the authorized version of the Bible, we find it occurs 532 times—476 times in the Old Testament, and 56 times in the New. God is represented as having a soul 16 times. "Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth." Is. 1: 14; Lev. 26: 11, 30; Judges 10: 16; Job 23: 13; Ps. 11: 5; Isa. 1: 14; 42: 1; Jer. 5: 9, 29; 6: 8; 9: 9; 12: 7; 14: 19; 32: 41; Zech. 11: 8; and Heb. 10: 38.

The word *soul* occurs five times in the Old Testament, where *nephish* is not the original term; for the word *nedivothee*, which the margin calls *darling*, is rendered *soul* in Job 30: 15; it probably means munificence; and in 2 Saml. 13: 39, and Ps. 16: 2, the word soul is added by the translators, there being no corresponding word in the Hebrew text.

The word *neshomoh*, or *nesme*, is once rendered *soul* in Is. 57: 16, the text we have chosen for our motto. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says, that "*neshomoh*, or *nesme*, signifies the Chameleon, a kind of lizard, which has its mouth always open, gaping for the air, on which it was once supposed to live. *Nesme* is rendered *breath*, *spirit*, and *life*."

It is rendered *breath* and *spirit* in the following texts, and expresses the idea of *natural life*, whether in *man* or *beast*. Gen 2: 7; 7: 22; Deu. 20: 16; Jos. 11: 11, 14; 1 Kings 15: 23; 17: 17; Ps. 150: 6; Isa. 2: 22; 42: 5.

But *nesme* cannot ever mean an abstract intelligence, or soul, or spirit; for it would be absurd to translate Jos. 11: 11, There was not any (*nephish*) *soul*, left to (*nesme*, to soul, instead of to) breathe. Here *nesme*, undoubtedly means breathe, and is so rendered. And in every other place where it occurs it either means breath, or a breather, or life sustained by means of breathing the breath of lives; that is, it signifies the chameleon or any other creature that lives by breathing. Our motto then should be understood thus, "lest the (*ruah*) spirit, or living creature, should fail before me, and the *nesme*, *breather* that I have made." And so in Psa. 150: 6; "Let every *nesme*, breather, praise the Lord." We conclude, therefore, that *nesme*, nowhere means soul, independently of our bodily organization.

Nephish is rendered *soul* 454 times; and *psuche* is so rendered 57 times, making 511 times that *nephish* and *psuche* are rendered soul, when applied to man; and 17 times in the original we find these terms applied to beasts. There are more than 300 other places where the same terms are rendered life, person, or body, &c: for, had they been rendered soul, in all such places, then the reader must have perceived that the word soul never could mean a something that could live separately from the man himself, neither as an "*immortal soul*," or "deathless spirit." Parkhurst says, that "*nephish* as a noun, hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul. I must confess," says he, "that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning."

We say the true meaning of soul is, a creature that lives by breathing; and as the essential endowment of such a creature is life, so life will stand often as a correct meaning of soul. When soul is applied to man, it may be translated life, soul, man, you, yourself, person, myself, thyself, &c., according to the text.

But some of our translators a little more honest than the rest, have ventured in a number of these places to insert the true word *soul*, in the margin; but none of them were honest enough to give us the word soul in every place where *nephish* and *psuche* occur. We shall endeavor to supply their deficiency.

In pursuing this subject we shall give the Bible answer to the following questions:

1. *Is the soul as great as theologians assume it to be?*
2. *What is a soul?*
3. *Is the soul immortal so that it cannot fail, cease to exist as a living being before God?*
4. *What is a spirit?*
4. *Is the spirit immortal, so that it cannot cease to animate the man?*
6. *We shall show that every text in the Bible will harmonize with our answers; even the very*

texts from which a contrary inference has been erroneously drawn.

Our motto most certainly implies, that if God were to contend forever, or to be always wroth, that the spirits and souls of men would fail, die, cease to exist as living beings before him. But waiving this, we proceed to answer the first question:

1. Is THE SOUL AS GREAT AS THEOLOGIANS ASSUME IT TO BE?

To this question we give an unqualified *negative.* For, 1st. *The word soul does not mean a ghost or independent entity when applied to man.* Because man and beast would in this respect be on a level with God. For if a man's soul is a ghost, or spirit, because the soul of God is a ghost or spirit, as Luther Lee argues, then we say that a beast's soul is a ghost also. Now, if the allowing the beasts to possess souls, as Mr. Lee admits, then upon this reasoning, surely all are up to a level with God, as all have souls: "For in his hand is the soul of every living creature, and the breath of all mankind." Job 12: 10.

Again, if a man's soul is a ghost, because it goes by the same name as the soul of God, then, not only beasts and every creeping thing being souls, are ghosts; and then, too, the soul of *sheol* (the grave, or death,) is likewise a ghost, because it goes by the same name, Isa. 5: 14, "Therefore *sheol*, (the state of death, or grave,) hath enlarged her *nephish*, (soul or being,) and opened her mouth without measure." The same reasoning would show that man himself as existing in this life, is a *ghost*, for God is called a man, Exo. 15: 3, "The Lord is a man of war." The same principle of false reasoning would convert a man's heart and eyes, as well as the heart and eyes of beasts into so many ghosts, for they are called by the same name as the eyes and heart, hands, and feet of God. And a tree must have sense and feeling, because it is said to have *life* as well as men. But what sort of theology is this? Cannot God possess an attribute that may be entirely spiritual, yet called by the same name as one in man that may be entirely corporeal? If he cannot, then how shall he be able, out of these stones, to raise up children unto Abraham. Matt. 3: 9. Surely the souls of these children would be corporeal, if made out of stones.

Again, God's soul cannot be separated from himself; for if it can, then is he *two Gods.* "But to us there is but one God." 1 Cor. 8: 6. Allow God's soul to be *himself*, as *nephish* when applied to God, is twice translated. Jer. 51: 14, "The Lord of hosts hath sworn by his *nephish*," (by himself). Also in Amos 6: 8; or him, as in Pro. 6: 16. "These six things doth the Lord hate, yea, seven are an abomination of his (*nephish*,) of him;" and we obtain the correct idea. As *nephish, the soul*, comprehends the whole being of God, so does the same term comprehend the whole being of man; and never means a principle that can live independently of the man or beast, to which the term *nephish* is indiscriminately applied; and is 25 times correctly translated "themselves." Let two examples suffice for the present. "He teareth (his *nephish*) himself in his anger." Job. 18: 4. Did Job tear his immaterial and immortal ghost? "Backsliding Israel hath justified herself, (her *nephish*) more than treacherous Judah." Jer. 3: 11. Has a nation a ghost?

Nay, but every nation has a being. Here, then, the arguments of Luther Lee, and those of like ("*precious*") faith, are overthrown by the translators themselves, though they were believers in the immortal-soul theory. It is vain to endeavor to array the soul, which is the man himself, with the attributes of independent conscious existence, spirituality, immateriality, and immortality, against the plainest declarations of God's Word.

2dly. *The soul of man is no part of God.* Because if every soul is a part of God, or if of the essence of Deity, as some theologians contend, then God is not *one* and indivisible, but is a multitude, and these multiplied millions of parts sin and die. "For the soul that sinneth IT shall die." And if so many parts of God sin, then these sinning parts are opposed to other parts of him; and thus this absurd theory divides God against himself; "How then shall his kingdom stand?"

Again, as the soul is sometimes unhappy, it would follow upon this theory, that God is sometimes unhappy. And if the dogma of the endless misery of the wicked were true, then millions of parts of God would be tormented forever; and, as some theologians represent, these souls of the wicked, as parts of God, will be eternally cursing the other parts of God!!! unless these wicked shall cease to become parts of God. But if so many parts of God can be annihilated, or converted into that which is not a part of God, then when God swore by himself—"As I live," the stability of his oath is overturned, because if one part of God may die, all may die!! Into such absurdities does this vain philosophy lead its professors.

Again, it is presumed that all will admit, that God, and all that constitutes his being, is *uncreated*, for he did not create himself, and there was none before him to create. If any part of God was created, then that part had a beginning, and is not eternal. But man, soul and spirit, was created, "as the Lord liveth that made us this soul." Jer. 38: 16. "Lo, he that formeth the mountains and createth the spirit" (*ruah*). Am. 4: 13. "The Lord which formeth the spirit (*ruah*) of man that is in him." Zech. 12: 1. The last two examples, refer to the *ruah*, as the principle of life. As soul and spirit were created and had a beginning, therefore they are not parts of an uncreated and eternal God.

Again, the soul is not only created, but created of the dust; for the same man that is called *a living soul* was made of the dust of the ground: "And God said, dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19. And Paul says, that the same living soul is of the earth, earthy. 1 Cor. 15: 47. Words cannot make it more plain than do these texts, that the whole man is a soul, and is corporeal. But should any contend that the name "man," does not include the soul, and insist that the soul was a something added to man, by the breath that was breathed into his nostrils, then man is only a body, and his body became a living soul. And this is true, for the creature, man, or body, or soul, that was made of the dust of the earth, and was lifeless, by the simple inspiration of the breath of lives, of *all* lives, became a *living soul.* That is, the lifeless soul made of dust, became a living soul, or creature. See Job's account of this matter, 10: 8–12, how God made him or his soul.

8. "Thy hands have bound me, (or my soul,) and formed me altogether, joining *me* together on every side, thou didst also finish *me.*

9. Remember, I beseech thee, as clay didst thou form me; and wilt thou return me to dust?

10. Was it not as milk thou pouredst *me* out, and as a cheese concreted me together?

11. With skin and flesh thou didst clothe *me*, and interwoven *me* with bones and sinews.

12. *Life* and *sensation* thou didst produce in *me*, and thy superintending care hath preserved *my breath*."—*Fry*.

Here the same "*me*," that is clothed with flesh and skin, and platted together with bones and sinews, and receives life and the conscious faculty from the Lord, is the same "*me*," that was moulded as the clay, and must be brought into dust again. Life and sensation are here made to depend upon the preservation of his breath, and to preserve his breath is equivalent to the preservation of his life and consciousness. Dan. 5: 13, "God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways;" and Paul, Acts 17: 28, "In him we live, and move, and have our being." "No man hath power to retain the spirit" of the breath of lives. "Man does not live by bread alone;" and, if "God gather unto himself his spirit and his breath," then "man shall turn again unto dust;" and "his thoughts perish." Job 34: 14, 15; and Ps. 146: 4. So in Job 30: 23. "For I know that thou wilt bring *me* to death, and to the house appointed for all the living." Job says that "*me*," (himself,) should be brought to the sepulchre. If the soul does not enter there, then the soul does not live, or the house is not appointed for all the living. In the first version of the Scriptures, the Syriac, the sepulchre is called the "home of the dead." Theologians tell us that it is the soul that seeks God, and that follows after righteousness. Very well. Read then Isa. 51: 1, 2. "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the rock whence YE *are hewn*, and to the hole of the pit whence *ye* are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you." The holiest part of the Christian then proceeds from the earth, and is born of earthly parents. Abraham sets his seal to this truth, for he says, Gen. 18: 27, "I am but dust and ashes." If Abraham was an immortal soul, with the exception of a thin, outside shell—the body, how could he say that he was but dust and ashes; nay, he could not have said that he was an immortal ghost, while any part of him was dust. Ps. 78: 39, (God) "remembered that they were but *flesh*; a wind that passeth away." But if a part of man was a ghost or spirit, would not God have remembered that they were but part flesh, and that the principal part of them was an immortal ghost? But all of man and of beast are of the dust, and all shall alike turn to dust again. The very highest nature that man has, irrespective of Christ and the resurrection, is flesh, an evanescent wind.

Again, theologians tell us that the soul is the essential part of man: we say, it is the man himself; they say it was created separately from the body. If so, why did not Moses, in recording the history of the creation of man, give us some account of this matter? And why did he exhaust his description, by giving us an account of the formation of the body? and why call this body the man, even before the living principle which they term the great "immortal soul," was imparted? Why use a phraseology that precludes the idea that any such soul was given? Will our current teachers please inform us?

Again: If souls are a part of God, or if they are immaterial spirits, then they are not *begotten* by their fathers, but are separately originated. But yet the Bible 14 times expressly declares that "souls came out of the loins of their fathers," and "that they were born of their fathers in the land;" not in heaven. Gen. 12: 5, "And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot, his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the *souls* that they had *gotten in Haran*, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan." That "souls were born in their father's house." Exodus 12: 19, and Num. 15: 30. In Gen. 46: 18, "These are sons of Zilpah, and these she *bare unto Jacob*, even 16 souls." Verse 26. "All the *souls* that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came *out of his loins*." Exo. 1: 5. "All the *souls* that came *out of the loins of Jacob* were 70 souls." See also Gen 46: 15, 22, 25, 27. Now I ask, did Abraham, Lot, and Jacob, beget these souls? Or if those 70 "immortal souls," came down from heaven, how came they in Jacob's loins? Say rather, that Adam was created with a pro-creative faculty, and as God caused the "earth to bring forth grass and herb yielding *seed after his kind*, and the tree yielding fruit *whose seed was in itself*, and after his kind," so man was made with the power to produce his like. Could these 70 souls that came out of the loins of *mortal* Jacob, be immortal ghosts? For how can flesh beget spirit? For "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," and not spirit, therefore to possess that spiritual, incorruptible, immortal nature, the *peculiar* privilege of the righteous, "Ye must be born again," of the Spirit, and by a resurrection from the dead, or ye cannot inherit an everlasting kingdom.

Again; the soul is not a spirit; for soul and spirit are separate things. 1 Thes. 5: 23, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, (or your whole person,) be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." This cannot mean that man has two ghosts. Perhaps it may mean your whole disposition, life, and person, the whole compound nature of man, for spirit sometimes means person. Heb. 4: 12. "The Word of God, as a sharp two-edged sword, divides asunder soul and spirit;" separating the soul-like or animal nature of man, from his higher intellectual and moral qualities. See also Isa. 57: 16; Luke 1: 46, 47. 1 Cor. 6: 20, "Glorify God in your body." All the M.S.S. close the paragraph here. The clause, "and in your spirits which are his," is undoubtedly spurious. 1 Thes. 5: 23, may have been a little amended by some officious copyist.

The word *psuchikos*, an adjective, derived from *psuche*, a soul, occurs six times. Strictly rendered it would be *soulical* or *soul-like*, or animal; and is kindred to what Paul designates the flesh, or animal nature of man, in opposition to the spiritual, or higher moral and intellectual nature; as in Rom. 8: 5. "Now, they who live according to the flesh, mind the things of the flesh, and they who live according to the spirit, attend to the things of the spirit. For the thinking of the flesh is (or produces) death, and the thinking of the spirit is (or produces) life and peace." Here are two thinking principles contrasted with each other; the animal or soul-like principle, called flesh, producing, if allowed to predominate, death; and the reasonable, intellectual, and moral principle, called spirit, producing, if controlling, life and peace.

In 1 Cor. 2: 14, and 15: 44, 46, *psuchikos*, soul-like, soulical, or animal, is translated *natural*; but in Jude 19, and in James 3: 15, it is rendered *sen-*

sual. In all these places the soulical nature is put in direct and strong opposition to the spiritual nature. And the spiritual nature, be it remembered, does not naturally belong to man, but is superinduced as a subsequent and peculiar development in the cases of those who have submitted themselves to Christ. Of those under the control of the soulical nature, Jude 19th verse, says, "These be they who separate themselves (*psuchikos,*) soulical men, or animal men, *not having the Spirit.*" And James 3: 15, "This is not the wisdom which cometh from above, but is earthly, (*psuchikos,*) soulical, or animal, devilish." Paul says of such, 1 Cor. 2: 14, "Now, (*psuchikos,*) a soulical, or animal man, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are (*pneumatikos*) spiritually examined;" that is, they are intellectually and morally examined. So much for the soul-ghost invention! Theologians tell us that the soul is a spirit or ghost, that receives and transacts all spiritual matters. Yet Christ says, "If a man hate not his own (*psuche*) *soul*, he cannot be my disciple." Luke 14: 26. All agreeing with Paul's well-known expression, "To be carnally-minded is death." The mere possession of a soul nature then so far from implying superiority, is conspicuously marked as the lowest animal nature, incapacitating those who possess nothing more, from receiving or appreciating the higher intellectual and moral communications and endowments. Therefore, says Paul, 1 Cor. 3: 1, "Now I, brethren, could not speak to you as to *spiritual* (men,) but as to fleshly men, even as to babes in Christ." As unto men governed by your soulical or animal natures, and not by your intellectual and moral. Nearly the whole of Paul's reasoning through 1 Cor. 15, is to show that the soul nature which we now possess, even with the accompaniments of spiritual graces, altogether unfits us for inheriting an everlasting kingdom, and is likewise emphatically incompatible with the separate existence of either soul or spirit; for he affirms, 16 and 18, "If the dead are not raised . . . Certainly also those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." That their hope has ended with the life they have lost. They are utterly blotted out of existence for the present and all future time; for, he argues, "if there be no resurrection from the dead," the dead in Christ live not now, nor will they live in the future. If there be no resurrection, there is no future life even for Christians, after this. He proceeds strongly to contrast the *soulical* nature of the first Adam and his descendants, with the *spiritual* nature which the second Adam possesses, subsequent to his resurrection, and the spiritual nature which his disciples will possess, who will live again through him, subsequent to their resurrection. The whole nature derived from the first Adam, he affirms to be corruptible, mortal, (*psuchikos,*) soulical, or animal and earthy. But the nature to be possessed *afterwards*, by the righteous at the resurrection, he contrasts with this, and affirms of that nature, that it will be incorruptible, immortal, (*pneumatikon*) spirit-like, or spiritual and heavenly.

It seems there were some in Paul's days who denied the resurrection of the dead, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, which rendered the sufferings of Christ, his death and resurrection of no avail, and the sufferings of his followers was likewise useless; their faith was vain, their hope was vain. They had predicated all upon a resurrection from the dead, and the rewards and the glory to be then revealed, and these doubters denied that it would ever take place. But alas! this same doctrine is practically and absolutely denied, by all who believe in the immortality of the soul!! For if the soul, or essential man, does not die, as modern theology affirms, how can he be raised again to life? Paul's language to one of these would be, 36 verse, "Foolish man! The seed which thou sowest, is *not re*-enlivened, *unless it die.*" We will paraphrase his words from the 44th verse.

The *soma psuchikon*, soulical body, or present animal, or soul nature of the Christian, is consigned to the grave; but he will be raised again, *soma pneumatikon*, a spiritual body, a real, tangible, yet heavenly nature, of which Jesus Christ is the first-fruits, being the first who has manifested this life and incorruptibility promised in the Gospel, by rising again from the dead, with a nature that cannot now be subject to corruption. This is the pattern after which we shall be fashioned. Thus hath Christ made death ineffectual to his followers, and hath illustrated that life and incorruptibility that he requires us to seek for. (2 Tim. 1: 10; Rom. 2: 7.) For there is not only a *soma psuchikon*, a soulical nature, which we at present possess, but there will likewise be a *soma pneumatikon*, a spiritual nature, with which Christians shall be invested at the resurrection. And so also it is written in Genesis 2: 7, The first man Adam was only made a *psuchen zosan*, a living animal, or a living creature, and therefore had nothing about him, but what was mortal and corruptible, but the second Adam was made into *pneuma zoopoioun*, a life-giving spirit, who will again impart life unto his followers, by a resurrection from the dead, connected with an incorruptible or spiritual nature not subject to death. 46th verse. But we do not possess this *pneumatikon*, spiritual nature, "AT FIRST," or in this present state, but only that which is *psuchikon*, soulical, or animal, and AFTERWARDS, when Christians are raised from the dead, we shall put on for the first time, our *pneumatikon*, spiritual nature. The first man was wholly made of the dust of the earth, and must, therefore, be of an earthly nature, unfitted for eternal life, and hence the necessity for the tree of lives being placed within his reach, that if he maintained his innocence, he might eat and live forever; but the second man, the pattern of the nature we Christians are to possess, is the Lord from heaven. 48th verse. As the first man, from whom we have descended, was made of dust, so we possess no other nature from the first Adam, but an earthly nature, and those that do not believe and obey Christ, will possess no other nature, and even if they should be raised from the dead, not having the germ of the spirit of Christ, they would not possess this spiritual or incorruptible nature, and would therefore naturally die again, without any positive infliction of the judgments of God; as did the widow's son, the nobleman's daughter, and Lazarus; who were only restored to Adamic or mortal life. But as the second Adam, or the second great head of all who will continue to live, was from heaven, we Christians who possess his spirit will possess his likeness, a heavenly, incorruptible, and therefore an immortal nature at the resurrection, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear. v. 49. And, as Christians have borne the likeness of the earthly and mortal Adam, so at the resurrection shall Christians bear the

likeness of the heavenly man, Christ Jesus. v. 5. For this corruptible, decaying nature, which we now possess, and which necessarily unfits us for an everlasting inheritance, must put on a something we do not at present possess; that is, an incorruptible body—we must put on immortality. 54 v. When this mortal nature shall have put on immortality, *then*, and not till then, will death be swallowed up in victory. The dominion of Death over the whole being of the righteous is complete; they sleep in unconciousness till the resurrection. But as the "gates of hades" will not prevail over the church, when Christ shall appear, then will his followers appear with him in glory, and the dominion of death over the righteous will then cease forever. See also verse 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, and 32.

We have merely amplified the arguments of the apostle. The immortal nature to be derived from Christ is strongly contrasted with the mortal nature derived from Adam. But if all men possessed this immortal nature through natural birth, then there is no contrast, and the apostle's strong argument is converted into nonsense!! The apostle's argument is plain enough as it stands, without our paraphrase, to convince all candid persons that man, in his present state, is not *immortal*; nay, that there is no principle of immortality, or perpetual conscious existence, naturally inherent in him. Can a soul that is now immortal put on, for the first time, at a future period, immortality? Paul says, 1 Tim. 6: 16—"God only hath immortality," and consequently, no other being but God is naturally immortal.

The word *apsuchos*, without a soul, that is something not intended to live by breathing, occurs once in 1 Cor. 14: 7, translated *without life*—"things without life, giving sound." The word *soul* is likewise applied thirty times to beasts, creeping things, and fish.

We therefore conclude that the soul and spirit are not identical, but two things, as much so as body and breath are two things; and that the soul of man is not what modern philosophy assumes it to be, but is the man himself, a mere mortal creature.

THE SOUL IS NOT A LIVING THING INDEPENDENTLY OF THE BODY.

We now quote a few Scriptures to prove that the man, or his body, actuates the soul, which could never occur if the soul were an independent ghost, and the body only *one* of *many* modes by which the soul could manifest life. Deut. 4: 9,—Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy *soul* diligently. Deut. 24: 15—For he is poor, and lifteth his (*nephish*) soul unto it. Jer. 44: 14—That they should return into the land of Judah, to which they lift up their nephish (*soul*). Ez. 24: 25—The desire of their eyes, the lifting up of their (*nephish*) soul. Hosea, 4: 8—They lift up their (*nephish*) soul to their iniquity. In these places, nephish is rendered heart, desire, or mind. The man lifts up or controls the nephish or soul, and not the soul controls the man. In Ps. 24: 4; 25: 1; 86: 4; 143: 8, David lifts up his soul to God. But he presented not his ghost, but himself to God to be protected and blessed. In Daniel 5: 23, "But hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven." Ezk. 31: 10, "Because thou hast lifted up thyself in height." Here and in many other places thyself is used, instead of thy soul. Then soul and self mean the same thing. When Ahithophel and Judas hung themselves, we suspect something more than ghosts were hung. Luke 12: 4, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body." Then the body itself lives. And thus we read of living, dead, or mortal bodies. How can the body be said to die, if it never lives? To affirm that the soul is the essential man and *never* dies, and yet to use the phrase a dead man, is a glaring absurdity. Deceived man argues that the soul, considered as an independent, ever living thing, is the life of the flesh; but God had eight times said, the blood is the life of the flesh; and once, that a sound heart is the life of the flesh." Prov. 14: 30.

Life, in the abstract, cannot be called the soul, or a ghost. Let the word life be substituted for soul in the following texts—Job 3: 20, Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and *soul* unto the bitter in soul. Ch. 7: 15, My soul chooseth strangling, and death rather than my *soul*. Ps. 66: 9, Which holdeth our soul in *soul*. Prov. 3: 22, So shall they be *soul* unto thy soul. Jer. 52: 33, He did continually eat bread before him all the days of his *soul*. Those who choose to follow this further may try the following texts—Job 10: 1; 24: 22; Ps. 66: 9; Isa. 38: 12; Lam. 3: 53; Rom. 11: 15; 2 John 5: 12; Gen. 23: 1; Judges 16: 30; Luke 21: 31; John 6: 53; Ps. 21: 4.

But the terms indicating life, such as *alive*—living, liveth, &c., occur 950 times; and yet 40 places cannot be found among them, where it would not be manifestly absurd to call them either soul or ghost. The word heart occurs 970 times, which sometimes indicates life.

THE SOUL IS NOT THE MIND.

There are but few places where it would not be absurd to call the mind the soul, and more absurd to call it a ghost. Deut. 30: 1, The blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, thou shalt call them to *soul*. Gen. 23: 8, If it be your *soul* that I should bury my dead out of my sight. Isa. 46: 8, Bring it again to *soul*, O ye transgressors. Ps. 31: 12, I am forgotten as a dead man out of *soul*. Jer. 51: 50, Let Jerusalem come into your *soul*. Acts 28: 6, They changed their *souls*, and said that he was a god. Col. 2: 18, Vainly puffed up by his fleshy *soul*. Tit. 3: 1, Put them in *soul* to be subject to magistrates. James 1: 8, A double *souled* man is unstable in all his ways. Ch. 4: 8, Purify your hearts, ye double *souled*.

These are selected from 70 places where it would be absurd to call the mind, the soul. If a few places occur where soul and mind can be used interchangably, so mind and person may be so used; but if mind and soul were synonymous expressions they could with propriety be *always* interchanged.

Now substitute the word mind for soul.

Gen. 2: 7, And man became a living *mind*. 1 Sam. 24: 11, I have not sinned against thee, yet thou huntest my *mind* to take it. Ch. 25: 29, Yet a man is risen to pursue thee, and to seek thy *mind*; but the *mind* of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life; but the *mind* of thine enemies shall be slung out. Ps. 40: 14, Let them be ashamed and confounded together, that seek after my *mind* to destroy it. Ps. 17: 13, Deliver my *mind* from the wicked, which are thy sword. Ps. 22: 20, Deliver my *mind* from the sword, my *mind* from the hand of the dog. Ps. 54: 3, Oppressors seek after my *mind*. Josh. 11: 11, He took Hazor, and smote all the *minds* that were therein, with the edge of the sword, utterly de-

stroying them, there was not any *minds* left to breathe. Isa. 38: 17, Thou hast in love to my *mind*, delivered it from the pit of corruption. Isa. 53: 10, When thou shalt make his *mind* an offering for sin. 12 v., Because he hath poured out his *mind* unto death. Jer. 2: 34, In thy skirts is found the blood of the *minds* of the poor innocents. Rev. 16: 3, And every living *mind* died in the sea.

But enough. There are more than 300 places where it would be absurd to call the soul the mind. And if a few places can be found where the words are interchangable,—so,

The eyes may be used to signify the mind or person, in 190 cases. Gen. 6: 8, But Noah found grace in the (eyes) mind of the Lord. Job. 22: 29, He shall save him that hath low eyes, or the humble person. Prov. 26: 5, Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes, or mind. Deut. 7: 16, Thy eye or mind shall have no pity on them. Ch. 28: 26, Her eye, or mind shall be evil towards the husband of her bosom.

But the eye is not the mind, because it can be used in a figure for the mind, nor is the mind the soul, nor the soul the mind, because in a figure the one may be sometimes used for the other.

The neck is used for the mind, or heart. or person. Exo. 33: 5, Ye are a stiff-necked, or stiff-minded people. Deut. 31: 27, I know.... thy stiff-neck, or mind. Prov. 29: 1, He that being often reproved, hardeneth his *neck*, *mind*, *heart*, or *himself*, shall suddenly be destroyed. Twenty times the neck is used for the mind. The head can ten times be called the mind. Ps. 83: 2, They that hate thee have lifted up the *head*, *mind*, or *person*.

The face is 38 *times used for the mind.* Prov. 21: 29, A wicked man hardeneth his face, or mind, or heart, or himself. Ez. 14: 6, Turn away your faces from all your abominations; that is your minds, or selves.

The hands are 48 *times used for the mind*, or *person.* Jud. 7: 11, Thou shalt hear what they say, and afterwards shall thy *hand* be strengthened.

The ear can be 17 times called the mind, or person: the mouth six times: the tongue five times: and the feet four times. Here are 320 passages of scripture where the members of the man can consistently be used for the man himself; and therefore it ought not to be thought surprising that the soul, though it means the man, may sometimes be called the mind.

In 76 places flesh can be called the soul, or a ghost, with as much propriety as the mind. Gen. 6: 12, "For all *flesh* had corrupted his way upon the earth." Ecc. 5: 6, "Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin." Isa. 49: 26, "All *flesh* shall know that I am thy Saviour." Rom. 12: 1, "Present your bodies (that is yourselves) a living sacrifice." Gal. 2: 16, "For by the works of the law shall no flesh (or souls) be justified." Eph. 5: 28, "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies," (or souls.) 1 Sam. 18: 1, "For Jonathan loved David as his own soul." Mat. 19: 19, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These last places make the body, the soul, and self one thing.

The word heart occurs 970 times in the bible; yet in four places only is the fleshly organ meant: and in almost all the other places, 955, it truly means the mind. Now it would be just as logical to call the heart an independent living thing, because the functions of mind and action are ascribed to it, and miscall it the "immortal soul," "the deathless spirit," or "the immortal mind."

AN EXPLANATION.

Lewiston Falls, Me., July 7, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—We observe, in the Bible Examiner for the present month, your publication of my letter of the 31st of March, as Secretary, making known to you the formation of the "*Reformed Protestant Society of Lewiston Falls, Maine.*" You have our sincere thanks for the interest you take in these our early efforts.

There is a point, however, in respect to which you labor under a misapprehension. And to set you right on this point, the Society has directed me to communicate with you.

Ours is *not* a *Church* organization. We have *never* called ourselves, or considered ourselves, as thus associated, to be a church. On reference to my letter, it is indeed clear enough how you came to receive such an impression. But the phraseology of the passages there quoted from our discussions in Conference, is such as naturally came to be used in the course of the *most general reflections* on the procedure of believers at various epochs, when setting out to make a new beginning in the Lord's cause, with the desire and the determination to secure themselves against any future introduction of error. Because we had occasion to speak of "Ecclesiastical Bodies," we used those terms; and because we perceived it to be necessary in our outset, to lay down and clearly define, the objects of our association, and the principles upon which we designed to act:—and therefore, in the first place, to establish a mutual understanding in respect to what we believe, and by consequence, in respect to the "*Rule of Faith*," we of course looked back to the examples of the old Reformers, and were led to remark on the "*Fathers of the Church*" as unwisely followed by some.

The very circumstance of our laying down a Rule of Faith, may have confirmed you in the supposition that we had *organized a Church.* But our object—though perhaps every one of us looked beyond this—yet our *immediate object* was only to establish a clear mutual understanding, and adopt an unerring, unmistakable *guide* as to our own course, as united in this Association for certain limited specific purposes. If we had, *in fact*, united for Church purposes, not one of us would ever have thought of designating our union a "*Society.*" Our object is quite distinct from such. The Association in respect to whose formation we communicated with you—requesting at the same time, among other things, that you would favor us with your opinion of the name adopted—is merely a *society of men*, who are *believers*; and it has been "instituted for the *purpose of meeting* for *conference and prayer.*" And as regards the nature of our Conferences, as stated on our Record, "we have it in view to promulgate correct views of the Gospel plan of salvation; to expose the popular errors; and to aid and encourage one another in the work."

In respect to your remarks on names of churches, we have only to observe, that, as we have never hitherto discussed such points, we shall not enter

upon them now. The explanation here given will be sufficient to enable us to appear as we are. Had the idea of any such misapprehension occurred, we might have guarded against it. and thus have saved you some trouble. But I must protest that such oversight did not proceed from "*haste.*" I rather avoided making my letter very long. But certainly I had time enough to attend to matters of such importance. Your printer makes me say, in concluding, "*Yours in haste.*" There is no "haste" in my letter. I have a copy on my desk. My words are—"Yours in the Lord." In my signature, you have an R. before "Sec. Ref. Prot. Society"; but there is no such R. in my letter, nor ought there to be.

We continue to enjoy the Examiner, for every month we have a feast of good things. We cannot just now enter into any particular comment. But such is the general excellence of these works that we are constrained to cry, *more! more! give us more!*

Wishing you an increased circulation, and many advantages in your new location, with abundance of Christian unity and love to comfort and encourage you in your labors. I am, dear brother,

Yours, in the Lord,

HENRY BALDWIN, JUNR.

Sec. Ref. Prot. Society, Lewiston Falls, Me.

SPIRIT RAPPERS.

Br. Storrs.—At the request of an acquaintance, I went last night to a meeting held for the *pious* purpose of inculcating the theory of "Spiritual Manifestations," so much talked of.

It was held in the Methodist Church in Sixteenth Street, where they have been regularly held for some six weeks. The pastor of the church was present, and opened the meeting by reading the 90th Psalm, after which he prayed. Among other things, he prayed that they might be guided by the counsel of the Lord, &c. What connection the counsel of the Lord has with spirit rappings, unless he lead men away from them, I cannot tell.

After this came experiences, speeches, &c. Their arguments seemed to me to be as weighty as feathers and strong as ropes of sand. As an instance, I can only refer you to the argument of one of the speakers against the idea that these manifestations were of Satanic origin. He said, we must judge by their fruits; and as they sent a woman in Auburn out with a loaf of bread to feed a poor woman and her hungry child in the street; and also told a rumseller in Springfield, Mass., to stop selling grog and send his children to Sunday school, therefore, they must be good spirits!! I will not weary you with farther remarks only to say, that any lawyer might have told the man to stop selling liquor there, especially as the "Maine Law" is in force throughout Massachusetts. H. S. H.

New York, August 25th, '52.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We insert the foregoing just to let our readers see the madness to which the natural immortal-soul theory will lead men, otherwise wise and intelligent. Here is a "Pastor" of a church, meeting with, and opening by prayer the meeting of a company of men who assemble to consult "familiar spirits," which God abhors; and against the practice of which he has denounced the judgments of heaven. Yet steeped in the false notion that dead men are conscious—because immortal—and can communicate with the living, this Pastor can profane the name of Jehovah by using it to sanctify this jumble of folly, deception, madness, hypocrisy, and wickedness. For all this is "Spirit Rapping." Their professions of regard for goodness or the Bible, have just as much truth in them as any other transformation of "Satan into an angel of light." Touch them with the spear of God's truth, *viz:* "The dead know not anything—there is *no knowledge in sheol*"—the state of death: that "the dead praise not the Lord;" and a multitude of scriptures of like character, and you will quickly see their reverence for the Bible and good things changed for the "cloven-foot," and the belching out of the *hate* they feel for that blessed volume of inspiration which condemns them and their wicked consultations of familiar spirits.

We say these things not expecting to benefit or reclaim those who are clean gone into this snare of the devil; but to warn those "who have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak;" Rev. 2: 24: and to put men on their guard lest they are taken in this "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie," and so "all be damned who believe not the truth" of *life only through* Christ: for "this is the record, (or testimony) that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is *in his Son;*" not in *ourselves*, as the lying rapping spirits affirm; and thus like their prototype---the Serpent---give God the lie. They love goodness! They love the Bible!! They good spirits!!! Just as good as Satan himself and no better. Beware of the natural immortal-soul theory---its the road to spirit rapping, and hence the road to death.

TRUTH AND FICTION.----The corrospondent of an exchange paper, speaking of the death of a sister, says---"Who entered into life, most triumphantly * * *, and whose death was noticed in the ——."

The *truth* of this notice is, that "*death*" was her lot. The "*fiction*" is, that she "*entered into life,*" at death, "most triumphantly"! We think she will "sleep in the dust of the earth" till Christ returns "*from* heaven;" at which time we trust she may *enter* "into life most triumphantly." *Then*, and not till then, does the Bible teach that any saint will enter *into life*, or *triumph* over death. *Then*, when "death is swallowed up in victory"----when "this mortal shall put on immortality," and this corruptible shall have put on incorruption----*then* shall be brought to pass the saying *that is written*. Death is swallowed up in victory;" 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54. This, let it be observed, *is not at* "*death,*" but "*at the last trump:*" 1 Cor. 15: 52.

"THE THOUSAND YEARS PAST."—We have been asked, "Why don't you say something on the thousand years past question?"

Answer.—Because we have really regarded that theory as so *palpable* an absurdity that it was unworthy a notice. We really think its manifest contrariety to *fact* and *Scripture* is so self-evident that it would be as useless to reason on the subject, with a believer of the theory, as an attempt to prove that midnight darkness was not noonday. We can no more believe the thousand years are in the past, than we can believe the reign of Satan and that of Christ are identical; or that the largest portion of the prophecies have utterly failed. Therefore, we have no controversy with any man about it. We trust the "second thoughts" of the *unpledged* ones will set them right. We have witnessed the anguish of spirit some of the "*pledged*" ones have felt when the truth of God has forced them to see their favorite theory of the millennium past, shaken to its foundation. But we spare them.

———o———

POSTAGE REDUCED.—We are glad to be able to announce that the National Legislature, at the close of its last session, modified the Post Office law, by which the postage on all *printed* matter is greatly *reduced*. All newspapers weighing less than *three ounces*, will pay only *one cent* each, when sent to any part of the United States; and, if pre-paid by the year or quarter, at the office where they are mailed, they will be sent at *half* this rate. The yearly postage on the *Bible Examiner* is hence reduced to *twelve* cents; and to any part of the State of New York to *six* cents.

Any *single* printed article, or pamphlet, not weighing over *three* ounces, can be sent to any part of the United States for *one cent*. "Pamphlets not containing more than sixteen octavo pages each, when sent in single packages, weighing at least *eight* ounces, to *one address*, and *pre-paid* by affixing postage stamps thereto, shall be charged only *half of a cent* for each ounce or fraction of an ounce."

If we understand this last item of the new law, all our *Tracts* are now subject to *one cent* postage each, unless at least eight ounces are ordered to one address at one time; in that case the eight ounces will be subject to only *four* cents postage if pre-paid.

"The postage on all transient matter shall be pre-paid by stamps or otherwise, or shall be charged *double* the rates first above mentioned."

"Books, bound or unbound, not weighing over four pounds . . . shall be chargeable with one cent an ounce for all distances under 3000 miles, to which fifty per cent shall be added in all cases when not pre-paid."

The *pamphlets* and *tracts*, it will be seen, when not pre-paid, are charged double the pre-paid rates; books only *one-half* more. The law goes into effect October first, so that all who now send to us for books, pamphlets, tracts, &c., can do as they please about sending the amount of postage to have it pre-paid. It is *cheaper* to send and have the postage pre-paid; but *safer* to leave it to be paid on being delivered. Our friends can take which course they please. They have already the weight of each of our works on the covers of the double number for May and June, also August and September.

———o———

HAM'S WORKS.—Those excellent Examiners, containing Ham's works, can now be sent to any part of the United States for *one cent* postage per copy, if pre-paid; or for two cents, if not. We, therefore, offer to send *eight* copies of either of those works, and pre-pay the postage ourself, for one dollar, current money, sent us free of expense. Let them now be scattered; they are doing, and will do, a glorious work. We have just issued a second edition of the "Generations Gathered and Gathering, or the Scripture Doctrine of Man in Death." It's just the work to stop the mouths of the lying "spirit-rappers," and arm honest minds against the soul-ruining "manifestation." There is no time to sleep, if we would save men from "believing a lie," to which many are being given up, that "they all might be damned who believed not the truth" of *life only in Christ;* for "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son.*" John, 5: 11. It is not in man himself; and any "spirit" that saith it is, is convicted of being a *lying one.* Touch the "rapping spirits" with the spear of God's word, and you will quickly see their "cloven foot," or their entire contempt of the Bible.

———o———

"ANCIENT TEETOTALISM." Such is the title of a work just received from DR. FREDERICK LEES, LEEDS, England, author of various works on Temperance, of great value. The work before us is one of deep research, and proves, "without contradiction, in every age of the world there has been a total abstinence movement." It should be republished by the friends of Temperance in this country, and widely circulated. It contains 16 pages octavo.

Dr. Lees is about issuing his Works, Original and Collected, with a Portrait of the Author. The entire edition, in 3 vols. post octavo, bound and lettered to subscribers, 16s. Vols. 1 and 2 will form the first, or Temperance Series, including the Discussions and Essays on Diet, Temperance, Physiology, and the Scriptural Wine Question. Price to subscribers, 10s. The second, or "Truth-Seeker" Series, containing the Philosophical and Exegetical Essays, and a Popular System of Logic, or the Method, Means, and Matter of Argument, will form Vol. 3, price 6s. After the Works are issued, the three volumes will only be obtainable *together*, price 21s. Will Dr. Lees send us the "Second, or Truth-Seeker Series" in Parts, as they are issued?

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1852. NO. 12.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW
Of the Doctrines of the
CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS STATES
between Death and Resurrection.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM,
(Congregational Minister, Bristol, England.)

THE subject of the present tract must necessarily involve a departure from the rule which we intend —with rare exceptions—to maintain in the conduct of this tract series, which is devoted to the theology, not of the independent reason, but of the Bible. A glance at the title-page will explain the reason of the exception, in this instance, to the general rule. The Scriptural argument for a state of non-existence of man in death, has been exhibited in the work, entitled *The Generations Gathered and Gathering*, but such is the state of mind which a long familiarity with, and faith in, the opposite opinion, have produced, that this interesting and important inquiry is in danger of being prejudged, through the partiality of the feelings, which, it is easy to understand, are apt to array themselves in opposition to, and to disturb that patient investigation which the subject naturally requires. The *British Quarterly Reviewer*, like most interested in, and, it would seem, pledged to, the maintenance of the popular theology, will not venture to confront the array of Scriptural evidence against the current opinion, but seeks undignified shelter beneath the assertion that our view is "materialized and gloomy." With him, and, we fear, with too many others, the question is not "Is it true?" but "Is it acceptable?" And viewing it from this standing point, it is not surprising that he should foreclose the inquiry, by condemning it as *gloomy*. We can understand how an ordinary reader might arrive at, and rest satisfied with this conclusion, but confess to a feeling of surprise that a learned reviewer should place himself in such a point of view, and thence give forth his verdict. This fact, however, but shows the necessity of meeting this objection on its own grounds, and justifies the departure, in the present instance, from our prescribed course of Biblical exposition.

It is proposed, therefore, to discuss, as fully as the limits of this tract will permit, the Comparative Merits of the doctrines of the Disembodied Consciousness, and Human Unconsciousness, between the periods of Death and Resurrection; from which we think it will be seen, that the doctrine of Human Non-existence, and therefore, of necessary unconsciousness in death, is a doctrine *less gloomy* than that in which the popular faith so implicitly reposes.

By non-existence, we do not mean to assert, nor do we imply anything touching the respective destiny of the component parts of man's nature. All we mean is, that after the dissolution of death, the conscious being, MAN, ceases to retain his consciousness, and is really extinct. That this is a mystery, and a very great mystery, is readily acknowledged, but not such a mystery as cannot be believed. No less a mystery, certainly, is the popular opinion of the elimination of the human spirit, as a distinct being from the material organization of man, at the moment of death, but which, nevertheless, receives the faith of the great mass of Christian men. Of this latter opinion, it may be said with truth, that it is the greater mystery of the two, baffling every attempt at intelligent conception. The former,—and which we maintain is the Scriptural view of the state of man in death,—is supported by the phenomenon of death itself, and of the preliminary circumstances of dying. The gradual decline of the expiring life—showing at every step of its progress, a farther withdrawment from all external things, until at last, all consciousness of what is beyond itself seems entirely to have ceased, even while the pulse continues its feeble vibrations—should encourage rather than forbid the conclusion, that death itself is a total cessation of the conscious being, and not a more complete retention and development of it.

How tenacious is the material organization of the life that animates it! And how, apparently at least, does the self-consciousness decline as life ebbs from its high mark. Even *before* death, self-consciousness is again and again destroyed, and in the case of the swoon and delirium, and *because* of disease and derangement *in the material organization*. Is it then reasonable to conclude, in the presence of such phenomena as these, that self-consciousness only seems to, but does not really, decline, until in death it actually expires? The phraseology, and entire reasoning of the Bible, bid us deny a condition of life for man *in*, or during the continuance of death, and therefore the popular theory, which maintains this doctrine, ought to be prepared to show that it is more rational to accept than reject it. Moreover, the mystery of absolute non-existence of the human consciousness in death, is commended to our intelligent faith by the fact, that previous to our human birth, we had no conscious existence. There has been a time when we were not, why should there not be a time again when we shall not be? What has been may be repeated. The doctrine of the soul's survivance as a separate being after death, has neither reason, analogy, nor scripture for its support, unless it be again absurdly maintained—as some of the ancients held—that the human soul has a pre-existence.

That this doctrine is gloomy and repulsive, arises, not so much from the view we take of the state of

man in death, as the fact that the doctrine *concerns death itself.* The subject is necessarily a gloomy one in *itself,* and whichever view we take, we cannot divest it of its essential gloominess. To our life-loving natures, death must ever appear as the king of terrors; and it argues no little against the popular faith, that they, who believe that death is but a new and higher development of life, have as strong an instinctive dread of it, as those who deny this doctrine. They who regard death as the door of life, and who believe that death introduces immediately to the bliss of the heavenly world, ought to welcome, rather than strive to shun it; and the fact that they do not so welcome its approach, is a strong presumptive evidence against the truth of their opinion. The natural instincts give the lie to the artificial faith. We do not forget indeed, that some have died in triumphant anticipation of a glory immediately following their decease, but this is no proof that their faith was right; all this fact proves, is, that death did not, and could not destroy their hope in a future realization of a blessed immortality. It is true they were expecting it at the moment of death, but the *time* of possessing their reward was less the occasion of their dying joy than the *certainty* of possessing it. These happy deaths are however, comparatively rare, which ought not to be the case; they should be the rule, not the exception, where the popular faith is professed.

It should, therefore, be distinctly pointed out, that those who believe in a state of life for the soul after death, and before the resurrection, view the fact of death with as much dread as those who regard the intermediate state as one of unconsciousness and non-existence. Like Hezekiah, they think it a greater blessing to live than to die, —although they profess to believe that death removes them from a scene of suffering and sin, to the presence of God and His Son, and the companionship of the holy and blessed. They rejoice also in the recovery of their dying friends, and, like Paul of Epaphroditus' recovery, speak of it as an act of God's "mercy." Here are ample evidences that a deep instinctive dread of death exists in the human nature, and which, despite a false though fondly cherished faith, expresses itself on all suitable occasions. The instincts of humanity are against the dogmas of false religion. Facts therefore prove, that even the *popular* doctrine of death is regarded as a *gloomy and repulsive* doctrine; so that there is no advantage enjoyed by the believer in the soul's separate life after death, over the believer in a state of entire cessation of the human being. No accommodating theology can convert the curse of God into a confection! Death is the curse, "the wages of sin," which we can never treat as a guest, but must ever dread as an enemy. The Christian consolation which the Bible administers is the assurance to all who are in Christ Jesus, that though they die, they shall live again, when Christ, who is "the Resurrection and the Life," shall come to raise the dead saints, and invest them with their "building of God,"—their "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;"—their "spiritual body:" or perfect resurrection and incorruptible nature.

So far then, the practical advantages of both theories are equal. The disciple of the one theory can be as hopeful and joyful in the hour of his mortality, as the disciple of the other. Nor is the disadvantage greater in the one case than in the other, for both theories recognize the necessity of dying —of passing through the pains of dissolution—and of quitting this scene of things forever. Each theory has its coffin and its grave. In both, corruption and the worm have their work to do. In these respects, neither has the advantage of the other; both alike are gloomy; and from one as much as from the other, our natures instinctively recoil. But beyond this point, there *is* a difference in the respective theories. According to one, the man has ceased to be; he is from this time, the subject neither of hope nor fear; of pleasure nor pain; of satisfaction nor disappointment. The "*shadow of death*" has cast its sable mantle over him; and the "*gates of death*" have opened to welcome him. He has gone down "*into silence:*" [Psa. 115: 17.] his dwelling is "*in the dark,*" in "*the land of forgetfulness.*" [Psa. 88: 12.] He is registered among "*the congregation of the dead:*" [Prov. 21: 16.] he is where there is "*no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom,*" [Eccl. 9: 10.] for "*the dead know not anything.*" [Eccl. 9: 5.] We are disposed, and naturally so, to turn away from this vision of death: we say, it is cold and gloomy. It is so; but call it not the writer's theory, nor a human theory at all, for its description is given in the language—not of speculative man, but of the infallible Word. The language and imagery are from the Bible. Turn away, we may, after learning the solemn lesson of our guilt, to seek deliverance through Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life;" but turn away to another theory, we cannot, without discrediting the revelation of God, and reposing in a mere fond conceit. This, however, is not the place for entering upon the proof of our theory of death—we will keep to our professed purpose, which is not to discuss here the truth of the doctrine, but the comparative advantages of the two theories.

We have admited then, that our view of the state of man in death, is most repellant to human feelings. But be it acknowledged, that both theories stand on an equal footing up to a given point—the point of actual decease. Beyond this point, whatever repulsiveness may attach to our theory of death, does not, let it be observed, affect him who is the subject of death, but only those who are living, and who may be contemplating it. To the deceased, who is deprived of consciousness, there can, of course, be no painful experience, whatever. All the repulsiveness that is peculiar to this theory, is in the aversion with which we contemplate the extinction of our being, The thought of not being is the painful thought,—and the *whole sum* of the gloominess of this theory of death.

We turn now to the popular theory of a state of consciousness for man in death, as a separate spiritual existence, or soul. Of this condition of the human being, we can form only a vague idea. It is beyond possibility for us to conceive of a condition of being apart from a material organization of some sort. To have an idea of personal existence, we must have both material and form. It may be of a texture as pure and impalpable as light, but a material there must be, however subtile, and of necessity our conception invests it with form, and gives it locality. Of a pure immaterial essence, we know nothing. They who believe therefore in the

soul's separate state after death, as the human personality, conceive of it, we apprehend, in a human form—the express image of that possessed before death, but of a substance altogether different—ethereal. The common notion of an apparition is probably that which generally prevails with respect to disembodied souls. In this condition of existence, then, it is presumed, that man passes after death. The human being becomes an apparition, a "shade," as the poets represent. Will it be maintained, that so far as this change of the mode of human existence is concerned, the popular theory of the state of man in death, has an advantage on its side? The *perpetuation of life* is an advantage, unquestionably, (supposing it to be a fact) but is *such* a perpetuation of the living being an advantage? Without offering any opinion on the reality of apparitions or ghosts, we merely ask, does the expectation of becoming one of these mysterious beings after death, invest the state of death with attractiveness? The popular theory holds out the prospect of an intermediate state in the society of shades or ghosts, into one of which we ourselves are to be transformed. This is a feature in the popular theory which does not belong to what we believe to be the Scriptural theory; is this feature, then, such as commends the popular theory of the state of man in death? Our's is condemned as gloomy—is this more inviting to human nature? If we may judge by our present views and feelings, we should be disposed to decide that such a prospective condition and companionship as the popular theory holds out, is rather *against*, than in favor of, its doctrine of death. It is natural to us to have a fear of supernatural existences. The disciples, when they saw their Lord walking on the sea, felt as we should have felt under such circumstances: "They were troubled, saying, 'It is a spirit,' (some have erroneously concluded that the word "spirit" here means the disembodied human spirit. If the disciples had meant the spirit of Christ, they would not have said "*a* spirit," but "*his* spirit." The meaning is, they supposed they saw *a being of a different nature*, a spirit,) and they cried out for fear." With respect, therefore, to the *personal nature*, and *society* of the intermediate state of conscious existence, the popular doctrine rather loses than gains by the comparison. Our human sympathies pronouncing the judgment of this view of the comparison, decide *in favor* of the non-existence, rather than *such an existence* of man between death and resurrection.

And if we examine the other characteristics of the popular representation of the intermediate state, we shall be prepared to admit that the advantages are decidedly on the side of the *unconscious* state of man in this solemn interval in his history. The period between death and resurrection is of necessity—even according to the popular belief—a unique condition of existence,—constituting a second estate, perfectly distinct from the first and last estate of the human existence. In religious phraseology, it is termed "the intermediate, or disembodied state." During the continuance of this state,—which must be long or short, according to the distance of the decease of any individual of the human family from the final consummation of all things—there is a complete separation, in the experience of the blessed dead, from all painful experiences of the former life in the body: but no less separate and distinct is this intermediate condition from that which is to distinguish the life to come. While therefore, this second condition of human existence is represented as a higher condition than the first, being exempt from all its painful contingencies, it is yet but an *imperfect* state, and awaits some unknown, distant period, when its condition shall be perfected. It is sometimes in general discourse, called heaven, and a state of glory,—but when its teachers enter upon an explanation of their theory, they always, as they are compelled to do, admit that it is but an *imperfect* condition—*not* that perfect state of glorified existence which shall be introduced after the resurrection of the dead. As man carries with him into this new state of existence his characteristic nature as an intelligent and emotional being—which his organic change leaves unaffected—he must be still the subject of hope, desire, and of all other emotions proper to him, as possessed of a mental and moral nature. By the aid of memory, he can recal the past, and by the faculty of foresight, he can anticipate the future. Let us imagine the spirit of the Apostle Paul in this interesting state. Would such a state be a heaven to *him*, or to any of a kindred spirit with him? The state, mark, is not that of perfect bliss, which is yet to be revealed, but of quiescence—conscious repose. He that was willing to abide in the flesh for the service of Christ, and the Church, would, we should think, be impatient of the restraints and inactivities of this intermediate state. In itself, too, it could have no positive attractions, for he says to the Church at Corinth—according to the popular exposition of the language—that he had no desire for the disembodied state: "*Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon.*" [2 Cor. 5:4.] Paul was only willing to leave this world on condition of being *with Christ*. "To depart," he says, "and *to be with Christ is far better.*" [Phil. 1: 23.] He did not mean to "depart" in the modern sense of his soul leaving his body, for he says, "*Not* that we would be *unclothed;*" but to "depart" from his present mortal and corruptible nature, and the power of death, which departure would take place at the time of resurrection from the dead, when "absent from the body," (the mortal nature) he would be "clothed upon," with an immortal nature, and so "be present with the Lord."

When Paul was on earth, he "groaned,"—to use his own strong language—for "*the redemption of the body;*" [Rom. 8: 23,] and he thus expresses his anxiety: "*If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" [Phil. 3: 11.] Imagine the spirit of Paul in this intermediate state, groaning for the redemption of the body, and longing for the resurrection of the dead:—could Paul be happy there? Could the intermediate state be a *heaven* to him? And imagine the souls of the blessed generally, looking forward to the pregnant *future*, as the season of their manifestation and glory: is such a state consistent with enjoyment and heavenly repose? Could it be otherwise than a state of dissatisfaction and discontentment? Think of the patriarchs immured in this state—cherishing ardent hopes of the future bliss—through thousands of long years. Paul tells us that these ancient worthies "having obtained a good report, through faith, *received not the promise:* God having provided some better thing for

us, (in these last days) *that they without us should not be made perfect.*" [Heb. 11: 40.] Is such a state of hope deferred consistent with a state of blessedness? Since there must be a lapse of time for the accomplishment of the beneficent purposes of God concerning the human race, the *consciousness* of this long lapse of time, (which is the vaunted quality of the popular doctrine of the intermediate state,) is rather to be deprecated than desired. To the Divine Being "a thousand years are as one day," but not to the human being;—to the latter it is the long slow moving series of ages, especially if a prospective good is at its farther end. This doctrine of a conscious state for a fractional part of man between death and resurrection is like all attempts at patching God's revelation,—a most miserable mistake! Blessed it cannot be, to live in a state of almost perpetual hope deferred; rather, "blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, for they rest"—in unconscious repose—"from their labors," awaiting "the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give" them "at THAT DAY,"—the day of HIS APPEARING.

The popular doctrine of a state of consciousness for man between death and resurrection, when examined on its own professions, is evidently rather an *evil* than a good. To the doctrine of a *cessation of consciousness* in this interval, which the Scriptures most decidedly teach, must be given the ready choice of every rational mind. On this latter, and unpopular, yet Scriptural theory, the holy man who died five thousand years ago is at no greater advantage or disadvantage with respect to the future reward, than the last man who shall die in this life. To borrow the words of Archbishop Whately, "the moment of our sinking into this state of unconsciousness will appear to us to be succeeded by that of our awaking from it, even though twenty centuries may have intervened; of which any one may convince himself by a few moments's reflection." (*Revelation of a Future State.*—Note C.) On the theory we advocate, *the moment of death is virtually the moment of resurrection, and the instantaneous realization of the great reward.* Not so, on the popular theory. The moment of death is to dismiss the conscious being to an intermediate state of imperfection and discontentment, possessed of a nature, and destined to be the companion of natures, from which our human sympathies instinctively withdraw, as both unnatural and undesirable. The state of glory, according to the popular doctrine, is far distant in the unknown future—waited for by the disembodied soul, but still disappointing its hopes, and prolonging its patience. We leave it, therefore, with the candid and intelligent reader to decide which, *on its own independent merits*, commends itself most to our approval as human beings—the popular theory of a state of consciousness, or the unpopular theory of a state of unconsciousness for man, between the periods of death and resurrection. They who judge theory by the evidence of its truthfulness, we refer to the volume entitled, "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; OR THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE CONCERNING MAN IN DEATH."

—o—

THE POSTAGE on the Examiner is *one cent*, or if paid in *advance, six cents* only, per year. To any part of New York State *half a cent.*

LIFE.

BY H. L. H.

"*The Father hath life in Himself.*"

Sublime and yet simple as are the teachings of our Saviour, there are few sentences among them all which seem more like loopholes piercing the darkness of nature, and letting in the light of heaven, than this simple announcement.

The wisdom and the might of men have their boundaries, and one of these boundaries is the line of life. As in ascending the Alpine summits you at length reach a spot beyond which vegetation cannot exist, so in proving the powers of man, you here reach a boundary that he cannot transcend. Man can plunge deep into philosophical investigation, and acting upon principles thus ascertained he can invest and arrange, he can bring into his service the existing powers of nature, he can thus command a force that is almost incredible—he can imitate nature—he can mould material in the image of animate creatures, but when he attempts to give Life even to the weakest insect, or the meanest worm, he transcends his powers, and is powerless. In the ordinary course of nature he can propagate his species, as can the veriest worm beneath him, but beyond this his power and wisdom may expend itself, in vain and futile attempts to convey animation to the smallest particle of inanimate matter.

And does not this fact harmonize with the declaration that "the Father hath life in Himself?" Up to this great central Fount we trace each of the ten thousand streams of vegetable, animal, and spiritual animation. In him we live, and move, and have our being. In this sense we are his offspring. Here in the great, the eternal, the self-existent one, do we find our source. His skilful hand moulded the parent of our race, and his vivifying "breath of life," with which he inspired the lifeless form, connects him with and renders him dependent for his very existence upon the Deity himself. Let but that spirit be withdrawn, let it be resorbed in Deity, and man must sink into the non-existence which preceded his creation. "If he set his heart upon man; if he gather to himself *his* spirit and *his* breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Job xxxiv. 14, 15.

If this then be a Scriptural presentation of the facts in the case (and who can deny it?) if our present and momentary life is from God—if we depend upon him for it—if we could not live one moment were his sustaining hand withdrawn—if when we lay down and sleep we awake for the Lord hath sustained us: (Ps. iii. 5.) if in a word, we live and have our being in him even in this life—how much more must we be dependent upon him for an eternal existence?

For the communication of life to his rational creatures on earth the Almighty has seen fit to employ mediums. In the beginning it may perhaps be said, without impropriety, Adam was employed by God as a channel or reservoir through which the principle of natural life could be communicated to the human family. This channel of communication having been polluted at the outset, can only communicate a transient and mortal principle of life to mankind. Such as it is we receive it as a precious gift, and though marred by the channel through

which it is conveyed to us, we still refer its origin to the Self-existent, the eternal One.

For the conveyance of immortal life to his people, God has in wisdom selected another medium—not liable to the accidents to which the former medium was subject, but able to preserve and convey to mankind, unpolluted and unimpaired, the treasure committed to him. Such a medium we recognize in the Second Adam—the Lord from heaven.

That He might effectually restore and redeem the human race, that he might fully remove the evils resulting from the transgression of our common father, and that he might communicate to his followers a deathless and eternal existence, it pleased God that in him all fullness should dwell, and "as the Father hath Life in Himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." And as the Father is able to raise the dead from their graves, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. In him was life, and amid the darkness that engirded and enshrouded a death-doomed race, this only could afford them relief. "The Life was *the light of men.*" He boldly declares himself to be the way, the truth, and the Life; and informs us that while the object of thieves was to kill and steal, his object was the communication of a more abundant, yea, a boundless Life. Standing by the sepulchre of a departed friend, he, for the consolation of the mourners, declared himself the Resurrection and the Life. And the apostle in accordance with this, while exhorting his brethren to heavenly mindedness informs them that (as they have, by putting off the old man with his works, renounced their relationship to Adam,) they are dead, and their life is hid with Christ in God; and consequently he points them onward to the period when He who is *their life*, shall appear as the time when they also shall appear with him in glory.

The conditions upon which the human family receive the Life, which is deposited for them in Christ, are so clearly revealed in the Word of God, as to preclude the necessity for mistake. If we would partake of the life and nature of the vine, a living bond of union must exist between us. God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live *through him.* And "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

If we would partake of this life we must grasp firmly the Life Giver, by an unwavering faith. If we would enter into life we must keep his commandments. And if we thus patiently continue in well-doing, if we seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, God will grant to us, at the resurrection of the just, his priceless "gift"—*Eternal Life.*

From these thoughts we may learn, *First*: Our entire subjection to the power of the Almighty. He made us and we are his. We subsist at his pleasure. He can preserve us, or he is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. We are entirely, soul, body, and spirit, at his disposal.

Second: We may learn our entire dependence upon God. His will determines our existence. To produce our ruin, to consign us to non-entity, needs not that power that was requisite to call us into existence. No, let but the sustaining arm of God be withdrawn, and we fall at once. This thought should make us fear to sin. How dare we offend the God that holds our life in his hands! How can we sin against him who sustains us every moment!

Third: We may hence infer the certainty of the future life of the redeemed. Everything depending upon man, is, according to the voice of all Scripture, and all experience, subject to accident and uncertainty. God hath no variableness nor shadow of turning. Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Every power and ability that man possesses he has abused, and in many instances *utterly ruined.* Facts demonstrate this. And if the future destiny of man depended upon anything inherent in him, it would be as mutable as the shifting wind, and the ever-changing clouds.

Thanks be to God, our future destiny is not thus uncertain. Two immutable things have furnished a firm anchorage for our hope, and strong consolation to our afflicted hearts. We trust in God. Our hope of Life rests in the Living Father. Like the tree planted by the rivers of water, we in this life draw the rich supplies of the grace of God; and like that same tree in the world to come, we hope to throw our roots still deeper into the Godhead itself, and being made partakers of the divine nature, receive from the unfailing fountain that life which shall be endless as the years of God.

This is the great discovery of the Gospel. Christ hath abolished death and brought Life and immortality to light in it; and in this blessed revelation we rejoice. In the language of Saurin we may say: "Death, then, has nothing, hence forward, that is formidable to the Christian. In the tomb of Jesus Christ are dissipated all the terrors which the tomb of nature presents. In the tomb of nature I perceive a gloomy night, which the eye is unable to penetrate; in the tomb of Jesus Christ I behold light and life. In the tomb of nature the punishment of sin stares me in the face; in the tomb of Jesus Christ I find the expiation of it. In the tomb of nature I read the fearful doom pronounced upon Adam and upon all his miserable posterity: Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return; but in the tomb of Jesus Christ my tongue is loosed into this triumphant song of praise, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? . . . . Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Through death he has destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; that he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage."

DOES THE CHRISTIAN DIE?

BY LEWIS BUTLER.—MICHIGAN.

"*Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die:*" John xi. 16. On this text you have given your views, and say, that to die in the absolute sense of the word is to be dead past a resurrection. On what authority you make the assertion I know not; but sure I am that the penalty annexed to Adam's transgression was not death in that sense of the word, or the penalty was never inflicted upon Adam or his posterity; and hence Satan is exonerated from the charge of falsehood, if your assertion is correct. But, I think that your views on the text are not correct, for God assured man that he should

die if he ate of the forbidden fruit; and God must have known that man would be raised from the dead, for Christ was a lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Hence his resurrection was as certain in the mind of Deity as his death; therefore death in an unqualified sense [for he used no qualifying term] admits of a resurrection.

In this position I am sustained by human authority as well as divine.

Brother Walsh, on the penalty of sin, or the nature of death says, "I define it to be extinction or suspension of life:" Bible Examiner, vol. 5, p. 12. In reply you say—"We do not, in the place he refers to, and we never did assume any other position than the one he contends for, viz: that death is the extinction or suspension of life; yet in its primary sense it is extinction;" p. 14. In your last position I think you are incorrect, as I have shown above. Again, Thomas Read, on the penalty of Adam's transgression says that, "he (Adam) must have understood it as death, the suspension of life:" Bible Examiner, vol. 6, p. 1. Again, page 2, he says, "Thus the sentence, dying thou shalt die, was fully carried out." Then, of course, the penalty does not preclude the idea of a resurrection, and is only suspension of life. If the views above taken are correct, then our Saviour's declaration amounts to this, that whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never have life suspended.

Again, that the Saviour did not intend to say, he that believeth in him should never die, so as never to be raised again, appears from the fact that he taught the resurrection in the context, 25 v., "I am the Resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live." Here all is expressed in the context that you think is taught in the text. Therefore, I think that my position stands unaffected by your remarks. Then he that believeth in Christ shall never have life suspended, but hath eternal life. This agrees with the quotations given in my other article, also with the following texts, John iii. 15, "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Walker defines "Perish, *to die, to come to nothing*." Now, it seems to me, man comes to nothing at death, according to your theory: and hence the theory must be wrong. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up (recognise him) at the last day." Notice—he hath eternal life; not, he shall have it, but obtain it when he eats and drinks the flesh and blood of Christ. This appears more plainly, if possible, by looking at the context, 57, 58 verses. "As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead," (not beyond a resurrection, of course,) "he that eateth of this bread shall live forever." See also 47–51 v. John x. 28: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish," (die and come to nothing.) 12: 25, "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." What can be more plainly expressed? and how can we understand this declaration of our Lord in any other light than that the present life shall be preserved in some form or other until we shall gain access to the tree of life, and through that medium have life perpetuated eternally? Hence the expressions of our Lord that they shall never die—live forever—hath eternal life, &c. This life if perpetuated forever is eternal life: hence it is said, they who eat and drink Christ's flesh and blood have eternal life: and in contrast, it is said that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him: I John, iii. 15.

I have explained the text under consideration to mean that life shall never be suspended; but I admit that death is some times used in an accommodated sense to mean less than the suspension of life; as in the case of Lazarus. Jesus told his disciples that he sleepeth; a figurative expression, doubtless; but one ill calculated to represent unconsciousness, much more suspension of life. But when they could not understand his meaning he told them plainly that Lazarus was dead; that is, according to the common acceptation of the term, accommodating his expression to their weakness of understanding.

Again: that this state is not death in an absolute sense of the word, and hence not suspension of life, appears from Luke viii. 53. Hence we have a narration of the death and resurrection of the daughter of Jarius, and a positive declaration of our Saviour that she was not dead but sleepeth; an expression generally used in relation to the change (called death) of the righteous, but never once used, as I recollect, in relation to the death of the wicked, in the New Testament; which fact, I think, argues much in favor of my position.

Let me here remark that the distinction you and some others make between extinction and suspension of life is unscriptural as it regards the human race; for there can be no doubt but what suspension of life was all that was threatened to Adam; for certainly God would not threaten that which he never designed to inflict; and he certainly intended that man should have a resurrection when he enacted the law to which the penalty was attached. See Acts xv. 18. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world;" and in relation to the second death that is expressed by the word everlasting and eternal; there being no difference in the nature but in the duration of the death, one being as entire as the other.

Let me now illustrate my position. If a man's arm were cut off, if vitality existed it would not be said that he was dead; and if his legs were also amputated, and life was still extant, it could not be said that he was dead; and so if his head was extricated, and the signs of life were visible, he would be pronounced alive. So if the entire corporeal organization were dismembered or dissolved, if we could see the signs of life, we should not hesitate to say the person was alive, or was not dead.

And wherefore should we doubt, when he who spake as never man spake, has told us that his followers shall never die, even though we cannot see the signs of life? The apostle has explained that which otherwise might remain a mystery. Col. iii. 3: "For ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God." With this agrees the anticipations of St. Paul. See 2 Cor. v. 1: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens * * * * we are willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Verse 9. See Phil i. 21–

23. I know how you and others of my brethren, believing as I do on the destruction of the wicked, explain these texts and argue these points in debate. To me there always seems to be a weak spot in your argument when you come to these texts; and were it not that you regain your arguments and repulse opposition by a reference to the Old Testament Scriptures, I think you would have been entirely vanquished on the sleep of the dead, as you define it. Now, this shows that there is an element of truth lacking; for if you had the whole truth on your side, you certainly could defend your ground as well or better on the New Testament evidence as Old Testament, which I think can be done on the theory I advocate. It beautifully harmonizes with all the New Testament evidences of man's life in the intermediate state, and at the same time corroborates with the testimony found in the Old Testament, that man is a unit, and that in the very day that his breath departs his thoughts perish.

I wish now to call your attention to a few texts that I do not recollect of seeing urged in favor of man's life in the intermediate state.

Matthew xvi. 18: "On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it." Now, I have been told that hades, or hell as it is translated, means a place of silence, or state of the dead. Then of course this state or place shall never prevail over those who by one spirit have been baptised into the one body or Church of Christ. This agrees with Gal. iv. 26: "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the Mother of us all." Thus we see that instead of the Church of Christ being in hades, or state of the dead, she is above and free. Eph. iii. 15: "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Here we see that part of the family is in heaven; and if you say that part are the resurrected ones, yet it would seem that if part were in hades that mention of them would have been made. Romans viii. 10: "And if Chrst be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." The sentiment here taught is that though the body is dead, or disorganized in consequence of the sin of Adam, yet the spirit shall live in consequence of righteousness, or obedience to the gospel.

Having thus given you the most important texts favoring the theory I advocate, I will look at a few texts that you quote in support of your theory. And first, we shall examine 1 Cor. xv. 18: "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" that is, if there is no resurrection. This text clearly proves in connection with the context, that there is no future life but through Christ; and hence is good evidence against the natural immortality of the soul; but certainly does not prove that if there is a resurrection of the dead, and hence that Christ is risen, and consequently that the faith of Christians is not vain, that Christians shall perish—die—or come to nothing: see 14–17. The 19th v. is of the same import. I cannot recollect any other.

Thus I have passed through an examination of the subject, giving some of the most prominent evidences and illustrations of the perpetuity of the Christian's life, and answering objections as briefly as I could, hoping in all candor that good may result to the cause of truth thereby; if I have erred, may God forgive my error; but if I have defended the truth, may he bless that defence. Amen.

LEWIS BUTLER.

Lock, Mich. April 4th, 1852.

THE ADAMIC PENALTY.

BY DR. TAYLOR, ENGLAND.

"God having created man after his own image, a living soul, endowed with the powers of reason, in order to form in him all the habits of virtue, besides the obligations resulting from the natures and relations of things, was pleased, in a command of pure authority, to exercise his obedience to Himself, his Maker, by forbidding the use of one tree in the garden, called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The threatening, in case of transgression, was that he should surely die. Death was to be the consequence of disobedience. Death is the losing of life. Death is opposed to life: and must be understood according to the nature of that life to which it is opposed. Now the death here threatened can, with any certainty, be opposed only to the life God gave Adam when he created him, verse 7. Any thing besides this must be pure conjecture, without a solid foundation. For no other life is spoken of before, to which death can be opposed; nor can we conceive, from any thing in the history, how Adam could understand it of the loss of any other life than that he had newly received. In this light, the sense of the threatening will stand thus: Thou shalt surely die; as if he had said, 'I have formed thee of the dust of the ground, and breathed into thy nostrils the breath of life; and thus thou art become a living soul. But if thou eatest of the forbidden tree, thou shalt cease to be a living soul; for I will take from thee the breath of life, and thou shalt return unto the dust of which I formed thee.' Less than this, I think, the threatening cannot signify; and I do not see how any thing more can be made of it."

"THE BIBLE AGAINST TRADITION."—We again call the attention of our friends to this work. *Shall it be issued?* It is for you to say. Without your help it cannot be done. Some forty dollars have been pledged; but we *must have* $200 to begin with; and that will only about *half* meet the cost of the first edition. Will the friends who desire the work issued send us immediately the amount they are willing to invest in publishing it. If it is not issued we will return your money at our own expense. One brother says, he "will be one of *ten* to advance the $200 immediately." Let us have it and the work shall be issued forthwith.

Let those who cannot advance their $10 or $20 tell us how many copies they will take and pay for, when it is ready for delivery. A few have already done this; and some have sent a dollar, saying—"Send me the work—pay the postage on it, and keep the remainder for your trouble." Who will do likewise? The work will probably contain between 200 and 300 pages, 12 mo. The price, *bound*, will not vary much from *fifty* cents; possibly it may be sixty-two-and-a-half. That is as near as we can judge at present.—ED. EXR.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1852.

OUR SUBSCRIBERS have now received the last number of the present volume. We hope few will subject us to the regret of discontinuing the paper and striking their names from our book.

Our terms are "*cash in advance in all cases.*" By the course we pursue, of discontinuing all papers not paid for in advance, we have kept our subscription list down low; but we have had the pleasure of knowing that those who receive the paper prize it, or they would not pay as they do; and we know such subscribers read it with more comfort, and are not afraid we shall dun them. We shall pursue the same course still, believing it best for all concerned; hence none need expect the January Examiner unless they have sent the subscription price.

We receive no subscriptions for a less time than *one volume.* One reason for this is, we print a definite and equal number each month; not to send the *whole* volume is to break it, and the remainder is of no use to us. We may as well give you the whole volume for twenty-five cents as three numbers of it, for the reason just assigned.

We wish to know early how many will be likely to take the Examiner, so as to judge what number to print. To induce an early payment, we offered in our last to give each subscriber for 1853 [or volume eight] the *two* double numbers of this year, containing J. Panton Ham's works, *without charge*, except they must pay the postage on them. That offer we limited to payments made before the first of December. We have concluded to extend it to all who pay prior to the 25th inst. Those who wish to avail themselves of the offer must see that they attend to it immediately.

The Examiner would have been issued *weekly* the ensuing year if we had believed it could be sustained. With only *one thousand* paying subscribers, at $2 per year, we would have gone forward; although that sum would barely have met the printer's bill, office rent, and expense of mailing. Not believing it could be raised, without crippling other papers, we did not make the proposition, though some desired it, assuring us that money could be raised. Our past experience, however, has made us cautious about pecuniary risks.

Let all who write us, *by mail*, address us simply, "GEO. STORRS, *New York.*" By adding the No. of the street where our office is, we are subjected to *two cents* extra. Some have continued thus to tax us, though we especially asked them, some months since, to "*be particular*" *not to do it.*

FROM ENGLAND.

We are glad to be able to lay before our readers the following from *J. Panton Ham.* We know they will be gratified with it.—ED. EX.

ST. MICHAEL'S HILL, BRISTOL, ENGLAND,
August 2nd, 1852.

To GEO. STORRS, *New York.*

My Dear Sir:—I feel that I cannot, and that I ought not to refrain from expressing to you my sense of obligation for the privilege which you have granted me of speaking to a large number of my brethren on your side of the Atlantic. Your kind notice of my two little books, followed up by the still more emphatic commendation of reprinting them for cheap circulation in the United States, I duly appreciate, and beg to present my best thanks for your kindness and trouble. If they shall help forward the great cause in which I feel it a privilege to be permitted to labor, in concert with yourself and other dear brethren, both in England and America—they will not have been written in vain. The warm-hearted response which the first reprint called forth from Brother Bacheler, contained in your July number, came home to me, as no doubt it did to you, like a hearty grasp of the hand. The enthusiastic approval of but one earnest man of God is an object worth laboring for.

From your Bible Examiner I learn that you are actively disseminating the great Bible truths that Immortality is a gift of God dispensed through Christ, and that the wicked will be punished not with endless torment, but "everlasting destruction." For the past three years and a half I have been permitted to testify for the same, as well as for some other truths, in this city: and it will rejoice you to know with considerable success. Although expelled from my former chapel for this testimony, for more than three years I have been listened to in another place by large and attentive audiences. Our church numbers nearly two hundred, with a congregation in the usual proportion. We have printed and published during the above period about one hundred thousand different tracts—a specimen of which I have sent you. You will see by the accompanying "Letters" that my course has not been very smooth—and that strenuous efforts have been made by ministerial brethren to extinguish the light that has been kindled. Still, however, the good work advances,—inquiry is rife,—and hearers abound. We have much to encourage us here. Let us pray for each other—that the Lord would give us patience and endurance to prosecute our labors diligently to the end.

For some months past we have had in contem-

plation the publication of a British Bible Examiner, and probably before three months are past, it will make its debut. As the Editorship will devolve on myself, and the risk be mainly incurred by myself and friends, I think of issuing it at first as a bi-monthly. Such a periodical we could probably undertake without risk of failure. Possibly it may, after some little time has elapsed, create a demand for a monthly.

I should like to possess the "Bible Examiner" from its commencement. Will you tell me through the medium of your next number what a *complete set* of them would cost, including carriage from New York to England?

May you, my dear sir, be long spared to labor in the Lord's vineyard, and be permitted to taste largely of the fruits of your labor.

Yours most fraternally,

J. PANTON HAM.

REMARKS BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—The "Letters" and "Tracts" were received, but did not arrive till after the last Examiner went to press. We are much obliged to Br. Ham for the package sent us. We have sent the Examiner in *sheets* from its commencement in its octavo form, for which we shall make no other charge than that he furnish us an article occasionally, and send us the *British* Bible Examiner when started. The package we sent by private hands to Manchester; from there to be sent by Express. When too late we discovered we had directed it to "St. Michaels," Bristol, omitting "Hill.'

The Tracts Br. Ham has sent us are *nineteen* in number, done up with covers in four packages. Besides these are four pamphlets of from 12 to 18 pages octavo, with the following titles, viz:

1. "The Anathema of the Nine Dissenting Bishops contained in the Letter of the Rev. George Henry Davis; A Reply by J. Panton Ham."

2. "The Popery of Popular Protestantism; A Letter on the Protestant Doctrines of Supererogation and Indulgence, addressed to the Rev. J. B. Clifford, M. A., by J. Panton Ham."

3. "The Weakness of Popular Protestantism: A Letter on the Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Intercession of Saints, addressed to the Rev. J. B. Clifford, M. A., by J. Panton Ham."

4. The Translation of Ephesians iv. 32, Defended; with an Appendix, &c., by J. Panton Ham."

The Tracts are entitled "THEOLOGICAL TRACTS," varying from four to sixteen pages, 12 mo. We give one of them in this month's Examiner, which we shall issue immediately in a tract. It is "*A Tract for the Churches.*" Price $1 per 100.

SINCE OUR LAST EXAMINER was issued we have visited Springfield, Mass.; Philadelphia; Paterson, N. J. twice; preached several Sabbaths in New York city; and spent eight days in Victor, N. Y.; at which last place we preached twelve times; we trust not in vain. At that place we became more familiarly acquainted with Brs. Levi and Caleb Boughton, at whose houses we made our home while there—and truly felt much at home in both their families; as also at Br. Cephus Boughton's. There are a goodly company of strong men at Victor, though their number is small. We shall not soon forget their kindness. They gave us *substantial* aid to help us on our way. May the Lord abundantly reward them. We shall not enter more into particulars in relation to any of the places visited, at present.

We would record the mercy of the Lord in our preservation in all these travels: especially in the deliverance he gave us on our return from Springfield. Between New Haven and Bridgeport, Conn., as we approached the Housatonic Bridge, it was discovered that the switch, near the entrance of the bridge, was misplaced. The engineer had only time to blow his whistle, and the brakemen to turn their breaks in quick time, and jump from the train, before the locomotive struck the right hand pillar of the arched bridge with a thundering crash, and in a moment the whole of the first arch, of 160 feet, fell into a mass of ruins; and the locomotive, its tender car, and all the baggage cars, had gone over the abutment of the bridge among the ruins. By the good providence of God, the hind wheels of the last baggage car had become separated from that car, as it went over the abutment, and were so embeded in the sand that when they struck the abutment they could not go over, and all the passenger cars were brought to a sudden and dead stand, with such force, however, as to do considerable damage to the platforms and their fixtures. We were sitting in the first car occupied by passengers—heard the alarm whistle; followed, almost instantly, by the crash in front, without knowing the nature of the disaster, till brought to the sudden stand mentioned. We then got out of the car and walked down the steep bank to see the ruins, and the awful perilous situation we occupied a few moments previously. We turned away from the sight, and standing alone, our heart poured out devout thanks to God for his delivering and preserving mercy. May our spared life be devoted wholly to Him; that when the great *trumpet* shall sound, as the signal that the cars of *this age* are to come to a stand, we may not be wrecked, but saved in the Lord to Life Eternal.

"HURT HIMSELF.'—*Who* has? "Br. Storrs." *How?* "By saying what he did in the last Examiner about the thousand years past theory."

Well, it is not the first time "Br. Storrs has *hurt himself*," and probably it is not the last; and if he had chosen not to "hurt himself," he could have remained in the Methodist E. Church, where he had gained a standing at least *equal* to his fellow ministers. When he commenced preaching in 1824 he held a military commission, with fair prospects of soon having rank with officers of the highest grade. He resigned all that worldly honor to preach the gospel of Christ. "*What a pity*"! said some of his friends—"*he might have been somebody.*" After attaining to some standing in the Methodist E. Church he withdrew from it, for causes not necessary now to repeat. "What a pity"—said some—"how he has hurt himself—he might have been one of our Bishops." Next he openly espoused the unpopular doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, instead of their eternal torture. Then came the cry—"*Geo. Storrs has used himself up.*" However, having obtained help of God he continues unto this day, witnessing to both small and great, saying none other things than what he believes he is sustained of God's word in saying; and strong to *confess* when he is satisfied he has been in error.

We have noticed this matter only to let all know that while we publish the Examiner it will not be our inquiry, what will "*hurt*" us? but, what is truth? and when satisfied we have it, we shall fearlessly proclaim it. Some theories we shall only name to show our disapproval, while the merits or demerits of others will be discussed at length; and our own judgment will guide us in our course, while we are willing to be reproved by friends or enemies, but we shall act our own discretion whether to open our lips in reply or keep silence. Our Lord Jesus thus acted. Some men it is useless to answer; nor do they wish an answer only to have occasion for more words. A discerning mind can usually tell what the motive is in seeking a reply; and where it is manifestly for strife and debate, the most severe rebuke is to refuse to answer them. Silence annoys and chafes them more than labored arguments.

We wish all to understand, while we conduct the Examiner, we shall express our opinions untrammeled, and in our own way; though we intend to be respectful in our language. If any do not like this course they will not sustain the paper: and they may further understand that we shall not alter in this matter to gain or keep subscribers. Whether we hurt ourself, in the case which is the occasion of these remarks, or not, remains to be seen. A time-serving policy we abhor. If we cannot be sustained in a free expression of thought our paper may go down, and we will dig the earth for bread, so far as food is concerned. We have no fears, however—the Lord will provide, and lovers of free thought and expression will sustain us.

—o—

"THE REVIEWER REVIEWED; A DIALOGUE; *Being a Reply to Eld. J. G. Stearns, on the Immortality of the Soul*, by GEO. STORRS."—Such is the title of a work of some 30 or 40 pages, 18 mo., to be issued in a few days. Price *six cents*, without covers: $4 per hundred. Our friends in Western N. Y., where Mr. Stearns' work has been so extensively circulated, we trust will circulate the Reply. Let us have your orders immediately.

—o—

NEW TRACTS.—We have added to our list of Tracts two new ones, *viz*: "*The Gospel Faith*," and "*The Gospel Hope*"; each 12 pages, 18 mo. Price 75 cents per 100. The first named should be circulated with the "Reply to J. G. Stearns," as it serves to show how prominent the doctrine of *Life* is in the Bible; and Mr. Stearns, like others on his side of the question, has made this grand theme a mere *figure* before the *goddess* Immortal-soulism. We need not say more of these tracts at present, as our readers have seen the matter of them in the Examiner for Oct. and Nov. Shall they be sent abroad? What are we doing to scatter truths which we profess to believe so valuable and important? Br. Ham's congregation *alone*, in Bristol, England, seem to be doing more in scattering tracts than the whole body of believers in this country are at present doing. Ought these things so to be? *It must not be.* Where are the funds and men to do this work? Something *must be done.* If the friends do not *individually* come up to this work, necessity will compel to seek *associate* action. *The work must go forward.*

—o—

HAM'S WORKS.—Shall those double Examiners containing the works of J. Panton Ham be scattered over the land? We have put them now at the extreme low price of *twelve and a half cents* per copy; or eight dollars per hundred. There are no works more valuable for general circulation. But our readers need no other commendation than what the reading has impressed on their minds. Let the work of scattering them be increased a hundred fold.

—o—

BR. MONCRIEFF will accept our thanks for his kind *intention* of sending us a "revised and cor-

fected copy of his work on the '*Soul.*'" But he will regret, as well as we, to learn, that through the blunder of his binder, the copy sent us contains only the first six and the last six pages, so that it is lacking twelve pages of the middle of the work; that is from page 6 to 19; though the pages sent are duplicate; the binder thus spoiling two copies.

"DOES THE CHRISTIAN DIE?"

See the article on this subject by Br. Butler, page 181. We cannot travel over all his ground for lack of room; nor is it *absolutely* necessary. We said in the Examiner for November, 1851, in reply to his remarks on John 11: 26, that "The expression of our Lord—*Shall never die*—must be understood in harmony with his other testimony: he had said in the same chapter, '*Lazarus is dead;*' but though dead, it was not in the *absolute* sense; to be dead in that sense is to be dead past a resurrection—it is an eternal cessation of being: in this sense the followers of Christ shall never die," &c. These remarks have drawn from Br. Butler a lengthy article on the question—*Does the Christian die?*

The text, John 11: 26, in the original, is simply, "*will not die forever;*" and so Prof. Murdock has translated it from the Syriac: he will *surely live again*, though *now dead.* The declaration of our Lord, four times repeated in the sixth chapter—"I will raise *him* up at the last day"—and which Martha affirms as her faith, in these words—"I know that *he* shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day,"—shows, to our mind, that the *personality* is dead, and the *personality* is the subject of the resurrection; and to suppose that "*him*" and "*he*" in these texts means only the *body*—as must be the case if *the man proper* does not die—it seems to us, is to strip the resurrection of all its glory. If Br. Butler is correct in his view, Christ never does, and never can raise his saints from *the dead;* for, they never die. All he does for them is to *preserve* them alive and raise their *bodies* at the last day. Then *preservation*, and not resurrection, of the "*him*" is the doctrine; and the text should read—"I will *preserve him* alive till the last day." But we submit it to Br. B., if he would think such an emendation of our Lord's words would be admissible?

As to the penalty of the Adamic law, it was *death;* and that death would have been "an eternal cessation of being" for all there was in man, or in the law to recover him from it—there was no resurrection principle in either. We do not see that it is necessary to suppose that Satan told the truth, because the Creator by a Second Adam opened the way for a resurrection; nor is he at all "exonerated from the charge of falsehood if" our "assertion is correct," as above defined. We are no stickler, however, for a mere *phrase*, unless it be a scriptural one; and we can part with the phrase, "dead in the *absolute* sense." To be dead, is to be *without life* in the *present time.* Adam died; all the list of ancient worthies died; not excepting Abraham, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and "Jesus himself, *died*"—for a time was without life: "I am he that *was dead*," &c: Rev. 1: 18. But Christ was not, and none of his saints can be holden "*forever*" by death. Christ did "*not die forever*"; God raised *him* up the third day; his saints "*will not die forever*," for Christ has promised to raise *them* "up at the *last day.*"

That the "resurrection of Adam was as certain in the mind of God as his death," in case of sin, lacks proof. Whether Adam will ever be raised from the dead may be doubted, without at all interfering with the doctrine of a general resurrection. His case is an exception to all others of the human family. He sinned under a *positive* law, with the definite penalty of death. Death passed upon his posterity by no fault of theirs; and for that reason their case is different from Adam's. The penalty of the Adamic law, therefore, may be death in the *absolute sense*, and precluding the possibility of *his* resurrection, as he *personally* violated the law, which none of his posterity ever did; and the death flowing to Adam's posterity not being the result of personal transgression may be reversed, if God please; as in the case of Enoch and Elijah, and as will be the case with all the saints who are *alive* at the return of Christ from heaven. But in Adam's case it could not have been reversed, and possibly never will be: it is possible he has "*died forever.*" The doctrine of a general resurrection does not necessarily embrace Adam. The term "*all*" is of frequent use in the Old and New Testaments, where it is "*manifest*" there is an exception: for example, 1 Cor. 15: 27—"He hath put *all things* under his feet. But when he [the Psalmist, Ps. 8,] saith *all* things are put under him, it is manifest that he is *excepted* which did put all things under him." Again, Rom. 11: 26—"So *all* Israel shall be saved," &c. Here it is manifest *all* is limited to those alive at the time spoken of. Again, 1 Kings 12: 18—"*All* Israel stoned him with stones that he died." Here it is manifest that the term *all* is used with a very large exception. These are only a few of many like uses of the term, and show that though there may be a general resurrection it may not embrace *Adam the first.* God *is true:* Satan is a liar. Death to Adam, *personally*, for

personal transgression may be, and we are inclined to believe it is, a death that is *absolute*—an eternal cessation of his being: for *him* there might have been no recovery; but he lived as an animal and died as an animal, and has perished forever. We think this possibly is the truth in his case; and what is remarkable is, Adam's *faith* is nowhere mentioned in the Bible. Abel is the first in the catalogue, Heb. 11th. Dr. Clarke says, a dark cloud hangs over Adam as to his final destiny. We have no evidence that any promise was made to Adam of a restoration in any way, or by any means. The promise—if it is a promise—in Gen. 3: 15, did not embrace Adam at all, so far as the language is concerned: God said *to the serpent*, "I will put *enmity* between thee and the *woman*, and between *thy seed and her seed;* it [her seed] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Surely *Adam* was not *the seed* of the woman: the woman was *of* Adam, and not he of her. Not one word of *promise* was uttered concerning Adam *personally;* but there was a word of *hope* for the *posterity* of the woman, though that seed was subjected to *vanity* or death. It was a death not in the *absolute sense*, but a death "*in hope*." No such hope is expressed or implied as to Adam himself. So far from it, God at once sit in judgment on him, *personally*, and proceeded to pronounce the awful sentence. And what was it? "*Out of the ground* wast thou taken: for *dust thou* art, and *unto dust shalt thou return*." The sentence is passed, but the day of execution is not revealed—God kept that in his own power, to *execute* the man on any day he pleased. Adam had fallen under his *animal* or fleshly nature, and was now a subject to the law of animal natures. "Thou shalt *surely die*," is an expression of tremendous meaning. It don't admit of a resurrection—God's word of threatening was plain and *absolute*—it could not be revoked, and his veracity maintained, so far as we can now see. And He gave Adam no intimation that it either could or ever would be revoked by any means, so far as appears from "the law and the testimony." It may be safely doubted whether, personally, Adam had any idea of a resurrection at all, even for his posterity; certainly he could have no hope of one for himself from any expressions of His Judge, so far as recorded. The Adamic dispensation ended—Adam failed—lost life—was tried—condemned—sentenced—and in due time executed. There the Scriptures leave him. It is a mighty *assumption* to say that, "God must have known that" Adam "would be raised from the dead." It is almost equal to saying—"God must have known that He was practicing deception on Adam"—that is, His lips uttered what His heart did not mean! Adam better never live again than the God of truth be demonstrated a deceiver! If God had said of Adam's posterity what he said of Adam *personally*, we can conceive of no possible hope of a resurrection for any of *them*. Blessed be His name, He did not do it; but suggested to the "seed," the hope *for it*, of a victory. Not a victory for Adam *himself:* no, not one such word to him: his doom was sealed, and when God should please to execute him he would go back to the state from which he came, *viz*, to "*the ground*": he "sowed to his *flesh*, and of the flesh he reaped corruption"; and for all we can now see, *he is no more:* and as the truth of God shall stand, to the confusion of the lying serpent, Adam did "SURELY DIE." Let us beware of making void the words of God, and opening the door for the idea that He can deceive and equivocate: for if the position is true, that God knew Adam would have a resurrection, though he expressed his doom in the most unqualified terms, then it *may* be true that when he threatens the contemners of His offered life, through Christ, with eternal destruction, he knows they will be *restored!* One is as likely as the other; and the principle is the same in both cases. Let it be kept in mind, none of Adam's posterity ever have been under the Adamic law; but *they* were placed under a scheme of grace differing in more respects than one from Adam's position. The grace dispensation proclaims pardon, for many offences, even. The Adamic made no offer of pardon, and seems from the very nature of the case to forbid it. This point, however, we cannot now pursue further, but may take it up again at another time.

We now return to the text, John 11: 26, and again say, if "life is never *suspended*," as B. argues, then life is never *restored;* and a resurrection of *him*—the man—can never take place; because *the man—the* "*him*"—was never dead. So it appears to our understanding; and B. is obliged to take the same position; for, in quoting our Lord's words, John 6th, he makes him to say, "*reorganize* him," instead of the plain simple idea of resurrection, as the words clearly signify. "I will raise *him up* at the last day," saith Jesus; i. e., saith B., "I will *reorganize* him"; clearly intending to convey an idea directly the reverse of the plain import of the testimony of Jesus. The expression "he *hath* eternal life," B. thinks imports the idea of *present* possession, so that the saint cannot have a "*suspension* of life." But the *he* and *him* import the *man*, not one half of him. Now it is a plain matter of fact that the saints do die—that is a matter clear to our senses, and plainly affirmed in the Bible; so that *the man* hath not *now*, in himself, eternal life; but God hath given it to us *in his Son*, and

his Son has promised to bestow it on all them that believe in him, by a resurrection from the dead, at the last day. Thus Paul labored and suffered, he saith,—"if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" Phil 3: 11. And that without a resurrection he would have *no future life*, is plainly what he teaches, 1 Cor. 15: 32, when he asks, "If, as amongst men, I was cast to wild beasts at Ephesus, what did it profit me, if the dead rise not?" and adds, "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die": that is the end of us, if there is no resurrection. In the next verse he saith—"Be not deceived, 'evil stories corrupt well disposed minds.'" We have followed Prof. Murdock's translation of the Syriac, in quoting these two verses. The idea is clear, that all future life is dependent on a resurrection from the dead, not a mere "*reorganizing*" of something still alive with a *body* that was dead. No such idea enters into the apostle's argument. If Paul survived, *in life*, after the beasts at Ephesus had devoured him, surely he would not say that it was no profit for him to have followed Jesus even unto death, although there should be no resurrection, or "reorganization" as B. calls it. Paul, then said truly, verse 18, if no resurrection, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished"; not simply because Christ was not raised, if there was no resurrection, as Br. B. seems to think; for such a construction cannot consist with Paul's words, verse 32; nor with the idea that Christ and his followers live before and without a resurrection, when dead.

The text, John 12: 25, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth *his life in this world* shall keep it unto life eternal," which B. quotes, and asks, "How can we understand this declaration of our Lord in any other light than that the *present life* shall be *preserved* in some form or other until we shall gain access to the true life"? &c.

We have italicised some words in the text and in B.'s question. "His life in *this world*" is his "*present* life." Is that "*preserved*" or *lost*? Let the parallel text, Matt. 16: 25, decide—"Whosoever will *lose* his life for my sake shall *find it*." Now that which is not *lost* cannot be *found*: and the context, John 12: 24, shows there must be a real death—"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and *die* it abideth alone: but if *it die*, it bringeth much fruit." Without a real death there is no such thing as a resurrection; without a resurrection no hope for the dead in the future; such is the tenor both of the Old and New Testaments. That this is a fact clearly taught in the Old Testament, B. does not question, though he thinks the New teaches otherwise; but we think the Testaments are in harmony against his view.

B. supposes when our Lord said of Lazarus, "he is dead," he uses the phrase "*figuratively*." If so, and Lazarus' life was only "*suspended* in a *figurative sense*," then there was a resurrection only in a *figurative* sense: that is, it was *not real*; but the 44th verse saith—"*He* that was *dead* came forth." This language also occurs in verse 49; and the 12th chap. opens thus—"Then Jesus, six days before the passover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which *had been dead*, whom he *raised* from *the dead*." Is all this in a "*figurative* sense"? What, only a figurative death and a figurative resurrection? No, no, Br. B., Lazarus was *really* dead, and was really raised from the dead. That the phrase "Lazarus *sleepeth*" is figurative, we will not now dispute; but his death was *real*. Sleep, however, is a figure *well* "calculated to represent *unconsciousness*"; as no person in a sound *natural* sleep is conscious: it is when we are in a disquieted sleep that dreaming occurs, or while but partially asleep. The remarks we have made on Lazarus' case will apply to B.'s note on Luke 8: 53.

B. says, the distinction we "make between *extinction* and *suspension* of life is unscriptural as it regards the human race": and he assigns as the reason, that "suspension of life was all that was threatened to Adam"; and adds—"for God certainly would not threaten that which he never designed to inflict; and he certainly intended man should have a resurrection when he enacted the law," &c.

That God *intended* Adam should have a resurrection if he *sinned unto death*, is what B., we think, cannot "*certainly*" demonstrate: and we have given some reasons against that view. Let it be remembered, "There is a sin unto death"; and John saith, "I do not say that he shall pray for it": 1 Jh. 5: 16. Such might have been Adam's sin, so far as he *personally* was concerned, though spared for many years to people the earth. His posterity not having "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," may have a resurrection by the *second* Adam. The second Adam fills up the place in creation vacated by the extinction of Adam the first, who was placed over this world in *dominion*, but lost it and has gone to *dust*, from whence he came. But God has not left the world without a head: the second Adam came, and in due time will visibly and personally resume the government of this world on the old Edenic ground, which was in Palestine; and the *tree of life* will again be placed in the reach of all who overcome.

We pass over B.'s illustration of a man, with

an arm, leg, or *head* off, and leave that to its own weight. That our Lord has said his followers should never die, in the sense of having life for a time suspended, has never yet been *proved* though often *assumed*. Paul tells us "the *dead* in Christ shall rise first," when "the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven": 1 Thess. 4: 16. Then life has been *suspended* from their death till the Lord returns from heaven. If B. thinks there is "a weak spot in our argument," in defending our views, we think our opponents are much weaker when they have to intimate that the Old Testament is not good authority. How do the New Testament writers defend their doctrines? Is it not by a constant appeal to the Old? Does not Paul say, that he said, "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come"? &c. Did not Peter say—"Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"? Surely the apostles were not in harmony with those who are insinuating the want of validity in the Old Testament *testimony*. Truly these insinuations are "*weak spots*" in the "arguments" of our opposers: but we can bear with their infirmities, trusting they will come to a better understanding of the Scriptures, as we have all had to learn by little and little.

We will briefly notice B.'s remarks on Matt. 16: 18. "Hades," B. says, he has been told "means a place of silence," &c., and adds, "then this place shall never prevail over those who by one spirit have been baptised into the one body," &c. If B. understands "*prevail*" to mean "never"—*at no period*—to have dominion over the saints, he certainly is not in agreement with the Scriptures. The Hebrew *she'ol* and Greek *hades* are words of the same import; and as Dr. Bloomfield well says, "The constant import of the phrase, both in Greek classical, the Old Testament, and the Rabinical writers, means *the grave*, * * or simply *death*."—Bloomfield's note on Math. 16: 18, edited by Prof. Stuart.

Our argument, then, that "Christ *died*"—"was dead," &c., which is the plain testimony of the Bible, is a sufficient refutation of the idea that the saints never descend into *hades*. The denial of it, to our mind, is the denial of the most fundamental doctrine of the Bible, *viz*: *the actual death of Christ*: for according to that view Christ did not die. Paul saith, "I delivered unto you *first of all* that which I also received, how that *Christ died* for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that *he* was *buried*, and that *he rose* again the third day according to the Scriptures": 1 Cor. 15: 3, 4. Again he saith—"Knowing that Christ being raised from *the dead* dieth no more; death hath *no more dominion* over him": Rom. 6: 9.

Here the subject is spread out by the apostle covering all the ground of B. Christ *died*—death had *dominion* over him, or prevailed for a time; but it was only for a short time; for, "God raised [him] up, having loosed the pains [literally, *the cords*] of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it": Acts 2: 24. He was under the *cords of death* for a time, and so are all his followers who die; but the cords of *hades* are not strong enough to hold them forever. Christ was dead and is alive again, and saith he, "I have the *keys* of *hades* and of death": Rev. 1: 18. "The devil *had* the power of death"; [see Heb. 2: 14,] but Christ died—descended into hades, took the *keys* and brought them up with him from the dead; and now hades cannot hold the sleeping saints longer than till Christ returns from heaven, unlocks the dormitory, and wakes them up: so "the *gates* of hades shall not prevail against the Church" of Christ, for Christ holds the *keys*, and can unlock at his pleasure. But to say, the saints *never* enter hades—never go into silence—is to contradict the plainest testimony of the Bible, and make void the *resurrection of the dead*.

A single remark on B.'s *inference* from Rom. 8: 10, and we dismiss the subject. The text has no such meaning as he infers. The sense of the original is simply "the body is dead *as to* sin if Christ be in you; but the Spirit is life *as to* righteousness." The contrast is *as to the government of "the flesh,"* on the one hand, and that of "*the Spirit*" on the other. The Syriac reads—"If Messiah is in you, the body is dead, in *regard to sin*; and the Spirit is alive in *regard to* righteousness." This is clearly the true sense of the text: and to give it the construction B. does, is to make Paul contradict his whole argument in that chapter, which relates to a deliverance from the law of sin in our members—the flesh, or body—and a subjection to the law of the Spirit of life, preparatory to a final "*adoption*;" for which he was "*waiting*." Let the reader examine the whole chapter with the seventh.

We have thus, briefly as possible, glanced at B.'s arguments in favor of the survivance, in life, of the followers of Christ when dead. To us it is plain no such doctrine can be deduced from any harmonious exposition of the Scriptures; if B. thinks otherwise we shall not condemn *him* for his opinions: to his own Master he stands or falls. Our wood, hay and stubble doctrines will be burned up in the fire of *controversy*, which some people so much dread: but truth fears not the light. May "the Father of lights" lead us into all truth and save us from hurtful errors.

REPLY TO VERITAS.

What is truth? is a question that I have often asked myself in examing the Scriptures. Jesus says, in John 5 : 28, "All that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good shall arise to enjoy life : they that have done evil shall arise to suffer punishment."—[Macknight.]

Luke 20 : 35 : "But those ; who are deemed worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage, for they are like the angels, and are the sons of God ; being, the sons of the resurrection : But that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob : Now he is not a God of *the dead*, but of the living for to him all are living" ; that is, those that are worthy to attain unto the resurrection.

Again, Rev. 20 : 10, The devil was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone : and will be tormented day and night forever and ever. This lake of fire "Veritas" calls the second death : this, he says, is the punishment of personal sins. After quoting John 5 : 28, he quotes the following—"Heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of my word shall fail." We would quote the same text in relation to the whole of the above. Now let us see how the matter stands.

Jesus says in John 5 : 25, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God : and hearing they shall live." Again, in verse 28th, he says, "All shall hear his voice : and shall come forth : they that have done good to the resurrection of *Life ;* but they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." Macknight renders it, "suffer punishment."

Again Jesus says, Luke 20 : 35, "They that attain to the resurrection cannot die any more, being equal to the angels." Again in Rev. he says that the wicked shall be cast into the lake of fire ; and John says it has power to torment them day and night forever and ever. This is the conclusion that Veritas is forced to. First—All that are in their graves rise by a resurrection, John 5 : 28. Second—They cannot die any more being children of the resurrection, Luke 20 : 35. Third—They will be cast into the second death, which cannot kill them for they cannot die any more, but it can torment them day and night forever and ever.

For myself I have not so learned the Scriptures of Truth. God is a God of Truth, and his word must be one complete harmony. The above makes the punishment of sin, torment in the lake of fire forever and ever : the Bible makes it *death* : "dust thou art and unto *dust* shalt thou return" ; Gen. ; not a second time ; no such threat was made to Adam, or any of his posterity, so far as we have been able to learn. Of all the innumerable passages in which the Scripture speaks of death as being the wages of sin, it never, in one instance, speaks of the second *death*, as the wages of sin. And when we get to Rev., where the term is used for the first time, it is in connection with principles that have exerted an influence in the world, and is used to denote the destruction of those principles.

Again, I cannot understand John 5 : 28, as referring to a literal resurrection of the *dead*, because from present light I conceive that it makes Jesus contradict the prophets, apostles, and Himself. For, in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely *die ;* dust thou art and unto *dust* shalt thou return. Gen. The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall *remain* in the congregation of the *dead*. Prov. 21 : 16. So man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep : Job 14. But Job harmonises with Jesus in John 6 : 39. Jesus says, that he should lose nothing that the Father had given him, but would raise the whole (that the Father had given him) again at the last day. So Job says, Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee ; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands. Job 14 : 15. But Job 24 : 19, contradicts the construction put upon John 5 : 28. Job says, "Drought and heat consume the snow waters ; so doth the grave those which have sinned : so the womb shall forget him, the worm shall feed sweetly on him : he shall be no more remembered."

David also harmonizes with Job and Jesus, John 6 : 39. David says, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave, *death* shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have *dominion* over them in the morning, (of the resurrection) and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling." Will not this happen to the righteous also ? let us see. "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the *Grave :* for he shall receive me." Will the wicked have the power of Death, or the Grave, removed from them ? They "shall go down to the generation of their fathers : *they* shall never see light. Man who is in honor, and understandeth not is *like the beasts that perish" :* Ps. 49 : 14–20.

Adam was in honor and did not understand, therefore he is like the beasts that perish ; and his posterity are like him. Paul says, it is written, Adam was made an animal, earthy, and those that are begotten of him are the same. Jesus says, God so loved the world that he gave his Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish—but saith he, ye will not come unto me that ye might have life : what then ? they do not understand : they are like the beasts that perish : Peter.

Isaiah also bears testimony to the same truth, "They are *dead*, they shall not live : they are deceased : *they shall not rise ;* therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them ; and made all their memory to perish" : 26 : 14. But Isaiah harmonizes with Jesus, John 6 : 39 ; and with Job and David. Mark.—"Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise" : that is, the Lord's dead. This harmonizes with Luke. "He is not a God of the *dead*, but of the living," for though dead to us they are alive to God. Paul says, our life is hid with Christ in God.

But it is useless to multiply passages upon the subject from the Old Testament ; the New must speak the same language. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal *life*, and I will raise him up at the last day" : John 6 : 54. Jesus says, "I live by the Father, and so he who feedeth on me, shall live by me" : v. 57. How do the wicked live ? Jesus says, "Your fathers ate manna and are dead." The animal life of their Father Adam was not sufficient to prevent them returning to the dust : but, "he that eateth this bread shall live forever."

The Apostle Paul also, had an ardent desire, that if by any means he might attain to the resurrection of the *dead :* Phil. 3 : 11. But it will be said here, that Paul desired to arrive at the first resurrection : and Veritas says, there will be another, the second resurrection at the end of one thousand years. I say, PROVE it I have never seen it. There is nothing said about two resurrections a thousand years apart by Jesus, nor the Apostles : neither the first resurrection. But when we come to Rev. 20, we find it recorded in that symbolical book : and I would here say that (in his Syriac Murdock,) leaves out what they term the second resurrection in chap. 20 ; and Albert Barnes says, they are both resurrections of *principles.* The Bible, so far as I am acquainted with its teachings, teaches but one resurrection, and that through Jesus. Acts 4 : 2. Paul teaches us the order of the resurrection. He gives us *Christ*, the *first* fruits ; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming : *then* the end, (Macknight ;) not a thousand years and *then* the resurrection of the wicked ; but then the end. Not one word is said about the wicked. If we make the punctuation Christ, the first fruits, they that be Christ's at his coming, it makes sense, and harmonizes with Scripture.

"And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose: and came out of the graves AFTER his resurrection: and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many": Matt. 27: 52, 53. This harmonizes with Daniel 12: 2, "Many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake to everlasting Life." Saadias Gaon, a Jewish Rabbi, says, "This is the resurrection of the *Dead* of Israel, whose lot is to eternal *Life:* but those that do not awake, they are the destroyed of the Lord: who go down to the habitation beneath; that is, Gehenna; and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh." The apostle speaks the same doctrine in 1 Thes. 4: 13. And "I wish you to know, my brethren, that ye should not mourn over them who have fallen asleep; like other people who have no hope, (of the resurrection of the *dead:* why?) for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who sleep will God, by Jesus, bring with him." Here the apostle makes it plain that there were those who had *died* of whom there was no hope of a resurrection of the *dead:* for this is the subject under consideration.

It agrees with his preaching that the resurrection of the *dead*, is through Jesus; it also agrees with the preaching of Jesus; that if they believed on him, or his word, he would raise them again at the last day. Peter, in his 1st Epistle 1: 3, bears testimony to the same truth, where he says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy hath begotten us again to a living hope, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the *dead*." We were begotten by Adam, but perished in him; yet are begotten by a living hope in Christ by a resurrection of the *dead*.

Paul gives us the manner of the resurrection of the dead, when he says, "If the Spirit of God which raised up Jesus Christ from the *dead* dwell in your mortal body, by it (the Spirit of God) shall your mortal bodies be made alive."

Now is all this array of Scripture truth to be set aside by one text, viz., John 5: 28, 29, which is admitted to be the only one which seems to teach the resurrection of the wicked? I think not.

It is very certain that Jesus was speaking to the Jews and to to them only: and at the farthest the word "*all*" can mean no more than the Jewish family. The offer of salvation, at this time, was not made to the Gentile world: they were neither just or unjust; but were without God and without Christ in the world—and their ignorance God winked at, says the Apostle.

But the people to whom Jesus was speaking had the offer of Eternal Life made to them: and saith Jesus, "He that believeth on my name shall pass from death unto life": John 5: 24. They should not incur condemnation. What is the condemnation? is it is to *perish*, or return to dust: John 3: 15. The ground of their condemnation is that light is come into the world; and men have preferred the darkness to the light, because their deeds were evil. 36 v: He who believeth on the Son hath Life Eternal: he who rejecteth the "Son *shall not see Life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him." God's wrath to Adam was that he should return to the dust. In speaking to this same people, Jesus says: For these be the days of vengeance wherein ALL the denunciations of Scripture shall be accomplished: Luke 21: 22. Again, in speaking of the same people he says, "Ye bear testimony for yourselves that ye are sons of those who murdered the prophets. Fill ye up the measure of your *fathers;* serpents—race of vipers—how shall ye escape the punishment of *Hell* (Gehenna.) Then making the charges against them he says, "*Verily*, I say to you ALL this will come upon this generation."

Now if those were the days of vengeance that all that had been written against that people was about being fulfilled, it seems very strange that Jesus should refer them to a resurrection of the dead for their punishment: which was not to take place for at least some *three thousand years*, according to friend Veritas' account! I should say something on John 5: 28, 29, but will leave it till another time. MACKNIGHT.

NEW YORK SUBSCRIBERS will receive their papers through the *Post Office*, unless they prefer *calling* for them, as we have no Carrier; and the number of Examiners taken in the city will not pay that expense.

PHILADELPHIA SUBSCRIBERS who do not receive their papers by mail will find them at Br. Armstrong's Book-Store, 209 Callowhill Street, 2nd door below Sixth.

"THE CHRISTIAN'S ONLY HOPE; or, *The faith once delivered to the Saints*, by Eld. Z. Campbell."—This is a pamphlet of 44 pages, 18 mo. For sale by the author, at Freehold, N. J.; and by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton Street, New York. Price ten cents. The title expresses the object of the work. It contains much that is very interesting. The author is a diligent student of Scripture.

INDEX TO VOLUME VII.

A Rap, 8
Another Inquiry, 45, 166
An Organization, Lewiston Falls, 102, 174
A Comparative View, by Ham, 177
Adamic Penalty, 183
Baneful Doctrine, Phila. Bap Asso., 24, 61
Bible vs. Tradition, by A Ellis, 49, 169
Death Cessation of Life, by Ed. White, 12
Dr Bloomfield's note on Hades, 41
Definitions, 112
Does the Christian Die? 181, 187
Endless Torment, by H. L. H., 33
Early Resurrection to Messiah, by Moncrieff, 97
Editor's Notes by the Way, 161
From Scotland, Moncrieff 156
From England, Ham, 184
Gospel Faith, Syriac Version, 150
Gospel Benefits, by Editor, 153
"GENERATIONS GATHERED," &c., by Ham, 65-96
Apostolic Doctrine of the Dead, 77
Christ's Miracles on the Dead, 71
Christ's Discourses of the Dead, 72
Implied and doubtful allu. to the dead, 84
Practical importance of the doctrine of the Dead, 91
Scripture Description of the state of the Dead, 69
Terms denoting locality of the Dead, 67
Value of Speculative Philosophy, &c, 96
Hurt Himself, 186
Kossuth and His Mission, 14
"LIFE AND DEATH," by Ham, 113-144
Edenic Dispensation, 114
The Christian Redemption, 122
The Future Retribution, 132
Language of Prophecy, 17
Luke 20: 34-37, 48
Labors of Eld. Blain, 59
Life, by H. L. H, 180
Macknight, 31, 109, 191
Man and Soul, extracts, 47
Moncrieff's Letters, 105
Methodist Quarterly, 145
Prophetic Periods, by Editor, 6, 22, 35
Present Dispensation, 36
Pres. Weethee's Letter, 163
Removal of Editor to New York, 104
Responses to Macknight, 42-44, 63, 164, 165
Response to Querist, 62
Reply to Veritas, 191
State of the Dead, by E. H. W., 26
Scripture Exposition, by Editor, 28, 45
Spirit Manifestations, by Dr. Fondey, 39
Sadducees and Pharisees, 42
Sabbath, etc, E. Everts and Editor, 167
Spirit Rappers, 175
The Question of Qu., by Moncrieff, 1
Tour to Winstead, Conn., 41
Tour to North West and to the East, 107
Tate's Defence, 51
The Spirit may Live, Frisbie and Editor, 56, 57
The True Wesleyan, 9
Universalism, by Mrs. C. C. Williams, 2, 20, 100
What is Death? 111